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# PARMELEE WINS AMATEUR TITLE New Jersey Veteran Tops 76 Players From Eleven States at Lake Mohegan 

## By KENNETH HARKNESS

Tournament Director, U. S. Amateur Championship

Clinton L. Parmelee of Newark, N.J., won the title of United States Amateur Chess Champion with a score of $51 / 2-1 / 2$ in a 75 -player Swiss contest held at the Mohegan Country Club, Lake Mohegan, N.Y., over the week-end of May 21-22. The champion was awarded a handsome silver cup as an emblem of his achievement. In the same tournament, New York's Kathryn M. Slater outpointed seven other women contestants to win the title of Woman Amateur Chess Champion of the United States. Mrs. Slater received an engraved cup topped by a chess Queen. Special Class A and Class B trophies for the players in these classes with the highest scores went to Victor Guala of Westbury, N.Y., and Eugene Salome of New York City respectively. Competing in this successful revival of the Amateur Championship were players from Connecticut, D.C., Florida, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Vermont, and Virginia.

The new amateur champion's duties as a fireman have prevented him from taking part in previous national tournarnents, but Parmelee is well known in New Jersey chess circles where he has won the state title and has competed regularly in club tournaments and league matches. Recently, Parmelee won the championship of the Chess Club of the Oranges. He is also a member of the Log Cabin Chess Club. Postal chess players throughout the United States are familiar with the name of Clinton Parmelee, for he has been a chess-by-mail enthusiast for many years. Although rated currently as a Class A player (2080 points), Parmelee was ranked as an Expert in 1953 and would probably have entered the Amateur contest with an expert's rating if his club's championship tournament had been reported promptly.

## Title Won in Final Round

The contest for the title was decided in the last round. In the semifinal session, Shelby Lyman of Dorchester, Mass., the young player who made such a brilliant showing at the Pan-American last year, was paired with his uncle, Harry Lyman of Mattapan, Mass. These two contestants were the only players to have scored four straight wins. The Lymans were content to draw in the fifth, giving Parmelee the
(Please turn to page 3, col. 1)

## MAYER TAKES KENTUCKY OPEN

Jack Mayer of Louisville won the Kentucky State Open sponsored by the Louisville YMCA Chess Club with $4 \frac{1}{2}-1 / 2$, drawing with Andrew Mike of Racine, Wis. in the final round. Second place went to Richard W. Shields with 4-1, losing one game to Mayer. Third and fourth on S-B with $31 / 2-1 \frac{1}{2}$ were Andrew Mike and Edwin Cohen. Mike lost to Don Johnson and drew with Mayer, while Cohen lost to Shields and drew with John Bloomer. Fifth to seventh with 3-2 scores were Edward Schmitt of Buffalo, N.Y., James A. Roark, and Dr. A. D. Rob-

## BERSBACH WINS INDIANA TITLE

Scoring $41 / 2-1 / 2$, Emil Bersbach of Kokomo took the Indiana State Championship at Logansport in a field of 43 contenders, drawing in the final round. Second to sixth on S-B with 4-1 each were Marvin E. Cox, D. O. Brooks, D. W. Johnson, W. H. Donnelly, and L. L. Richardson. 1954 Champion Paul Fisher led those with $31 / 2-1^{1 / 2}$ scores, it being Indiana tradition that a champion does not repeat.
At the annual meeting of the Indiana Ass'n prior to the tournament affiliation with the USCF was voted. Glen C. Donley of Logansport was elected president, Fred Flanding of Portland treasurer, D. E. Rhead of Gary secretary, and Emil Bersbach of Kokomo tournament director. It was also voted to hold an Open Tournament at Logansport this fall, date to be determined later.

## U. S. JUNIOR CHAMPIONSHIP <br> July 15-24, 1955 <br> Lincoln, Nebraska

# Finish It The Clever Way! <br> by Edmund Nash 

Position No. 153
Geller vs. Smyslov
Final Match Game, 1955


Position No. 154
Botvinnik vs. Kotov USSR, 1955


AFTER six draws, Geller won the 7th match game and the USSR chess championship. In Position No. 153, though a pawn down, Geller has an overwhelming positional superiority. In the game, Black resigned after White's 4th move (the moves were not forced). The colors have been reversed for convenience in solving from the diagram; likewise in the second position.

In Position No. 154, from the championship tournament in which he tied for third place, world champion Botvinnik brilliantly overcomes the apparent drawishness of the position (Bishops on opposite colored squares). Two consecutive pawn sacrifices force the win.

For solution, please turn to Page Eight.
Send all contributions for this column to Edmund Nash, 1530 28th Plece, S.E. Washington 20, D. C.

The new Irish Chess magazine Ficheall represents a national cooperative endeavor at its highest. The Irish Chess Union owns the press and type for printing the publication, and the editing and presswork is done by volunteer and amateur printing talent, mainly drawn
HAVE YOUR TOURNAMENTS
OFFICIALLY RATED
New Regulations
Effective March 1, 1955
Tournaments, matches (individual or team; round robin or Swiss) are affiliated organizations, if played under FIDE Laws, directed by a competent official, and played at time limit of not more than 30 moves per hour.
The annual championship tournathe annual championship tournament of any USCF affiliate whose By-Laws provide that all Its members must be USCF members also are rated without charge.
All other eligible events are rated only if official report of event is accompanied by a remittance covering a rating fee of 10 c per game for all games actually played in the contest. (In a Swiss one-half the ber of players times the numgames played if no byes or forfeits.)
Note that 10c Rating fee per game is collected from all players, whether USCF members or not.
Semi-annually ratings will be published of all participants in all SCF-Rated events.
Official rating forms should
be secured in advance from:-
Montgomery Major
123 No. Humphrey Avenue Oak Park, Illinois
Do not write to other USCF officials for these rating forms.
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from the Clontarf Chess Club of Dublin. This is one way of keeping printing costs down.

Milwaukee won a quadrangular team match at Sheboygan, besting Madison $31 / 2-21 / 2$, Racine $41 / 2-11 / 2$, and Sheboygan 6-0. Madison was second, downing Racine $4-2$ and Sheboygan 5-1, while Racine defeated Sheboygan $41 / 2-1^{1 / 2}$. Members of the winning Milwaukee team were R. Kujoth, Mark Surgies, J. Grkavac, O. Francisco, Fed Zarse, and G. Hurley.

Canadian Co-Champion D. A. Yanofsky will represent Canada at the Interzonal in Goteborg, Sweden this August according to the Vancouver Province, since scholastic commitments have prevented CoChampion Frank R. Anderson from playing the projected play-off match with Yanofsky.

## PARUTA TAKES CLEVELAND OPEN

On S-B points M. Paruta captured the Cleveland Open Championship with a $61 / 2-11 / 2$ score in a 37 -player Swiss event, losing one game to runner-up Durwood Hatch and drawing with J. Gilchrist. Hatch also scored $61 / 2-11 / 2$ for second, losing a game to W . Rayle and drawing with E. Schara. Schara and J. Harvey were third and fourth on S-B with 6-2 each, while Gilchrist and J. Kapustij were fifth and sixth with $51 / 2-21 / 2$ scores. Seventh to tenth on S.B. with 5-3, each were W. Rayle, G. Bartkus, T. McClancy, and J. Louie. The Cleveland Junior title was awarded to G. Bartkus as ranking junior player, with J. Louis second and R. Kvetko (3-5) third.

## STEVENS TOPS BUCCANEER OPEN

Blake W. Stevens of San Antonio scored $4-1$ to win the Buccaneer Day on S-B points, losing one game to Henry Youngman. Second to fourth, also with 4-1 each, were R. B. Potter, Robert Brieger, and R. L. Garver. Eric Bone was fifth with $31 / 2-$ $11 / 2$. Potter lost a game to S. Dale McLemore, Brieger to W. C. Browning, Garver to James Creighton, while Bone lost to McLemore and drew with Jack D. Moore.
The Junior Championship went to Earl Dean with 4-1 on S-B points in a tie with Gerald Blair. Third, also with 41, was Eldridge Custer. Both events were sponsored by the USCF Affiliated Corpus Christi Chess Club and were conducted in connection with the Corpus Christi "Buccaneer Days" festival. International Master George Koltanowski served as tournament director.

## SURGIES TAKES MILWAUKEE CO

After winning this event for three years in a row, Arpad Elo finally relinquished the Milwaukee County title to Mark Surgies who scored 8-1. Surgies played solid chess throughout, but was helped by the competition. In the 7th round Zarse won a piece by force from Surgies only to blunder a few moves later and be forced to be content with a draw, The other draw was with Averill Powers, 1954 State Champion. In the 5 th round Surgies offered Elo a draw which was refused by Elo who then blundered away a piece two moves later for the margin of victory for Surgies. Arpad Elo placed second and Averill Powers third with 7-2 each, followed by Orville Francisco with $61 / 2-21 / 2$. An outstanding feature of the 57 player event was the exceptional strength shown by the younger players in Milwaukee: Cheek, Mangan, Southern, Zarse, Jakobowski, etc.

## CHICAGO CITY ENDS IN TIE

Finals of the Chicago City Championship ended in a tie between former U.S. Open Champion Albert Sandrin and former Illinois Open Champion Povilas Tautvaisas with $71 / 2-11 / 2$ each. A short match is planned to decide the title. Sandrin led throughout the tourney until he lost an adjourned game to his brother, Angelo Sandrin, and drew with D. Fischheimer. Tautvaisas lost his game to Sandrin and drew with K. Czerniecki in the 10 -player round robin. C. Henin and D. Fischheimer tied for third with 5-4 each, and E. Buerger and S. Cohen tied for fifth with $41 / 2-41 / 2$. Angelo Sandrin and M. Turiansky placed seventh with $31 / 2-51 / 2$ each.

[^0] Affiliated Club.

# Chess Life In Vew York 

THE U. S. Amateur Championship at the Mohegan Country Club was by and large, a great success. It introduced and tested several new ideas, most of which worked out so well that they are worthy of consideration by all tournament directors for future use.

The basic concepts were, it seems to your reporter: 1) No money prizes, but attractive title offered, 2) A tournament at a resort spot for the pleasure of the players' families, 3) An entire tournament in one weekend.

The first idea worked out well: seventy-five players entered the tournament. This may indicate a trend towards cups, trophies, and titles, and away from cash prizes, much the way Bridge and Table Tennis tournaments are run. The second concept was, it appeared, a joy to non-playing visitors. The Mohegan Country Club is a beautiful place with enough activities to satisfy almost every recreational desire. Players' families as well as visiting New Yorkers (several carloads arrived on Sunday to watch the conclusion of the tournament) swam, boated, and played tennis, ping-pong, softball, and handball. Unfortunately, with six rounds in two and a half days, the participants themselves had no time to enjoy the sports. But what a place to hold the Open!

Staging an entire tournament over one weekend had the usual drawbacks-too few rounds (generally, in a Swiss, there should be about one-quarter as many rounds as players), too much chess in so short a time. And the tournament director had simply too much to do. It seemed that Ken Harkness, in order to have the pairings ready on time and keep the tournament running smoothly, had to do a week's work in a weekend. He accomplished this Herculean feat by staying awake for nearly three whole days! Credit must also be given to Bill Slater and Max Pavey who also worked hard to make the tourney a success.

With so many New Yorkers participating, it was not unexpected when three of the four prizes went to New York players. Congratulations to Clinton Parmalee of New Jersey for winning the tournament, and to New Yorkers, Vic Guala (Manhattan C. C.), Eugene Salome (Manhattan C. C.), and Kathryn Slater (Marshall and London Terace C. C.) for winning the A, B, and Women's Cups.

Brooklyn (N.Y.) Chess Club: P. Zirnis scored $7-2$ to win the club title, losing games to G. Znotins and H. Feldheim. Znotins was second with $61 / 2-21 / 2$, while third and fourth with $51 / 2-31 / 2$ each were H. Spinner and H. Feldheim. In the prelims, A. Purmalis won section A $51 / 2-1 / 2$, with Znotins second with $41 / 2-11 / 2$, and Feldheim and M. Merado third with $31 / 2-21 / 2$; in section B, J. Pamiljens scored $6-0$, followed by H. Polstein $41 / 2-$ $11 / 2$, and $\mathbf{C}$. Nigro $4-2$; in section $\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{P}$ Zirnis and S. Wassner tallied 5-1 each and L. Bader 4-2. A USCF Affiliated Club.

# U. S. AMATEUR CHAMPIONSHIP 

(Continued from Page 1, col. 3)
opportunity to equal their score of $4^{1 / 2}$ points by a brilliant win over David Steinberg of New York. In the final round, Parmelee defeated Shelby Lyman in decisive fashion while Uncle Harry was held to a draw by Frank S. Nagy of Passaic, N.J.

Harry Lyman's final score of 5 points was equalled by Russell Chauvenet of Silver Spring, Md., Victor A. Guala of Westbury, N.Y., and Roy T. Black of Williamsville, N.Y. Tie-breaking points placed Chauvenet in the runner-up position. Roy Black, although ranked as a Master Emeritus, was eligible to compete in this non-master tournament because his actual rating is 2292 points. As the highest-rated contestant, Mr. Black was favored to win the title; but a startling upset in the second round, when the up-state veteran lost to unrated player Murray Kravitz of Brooklyn in 9 moves, made it impossible for Mr. Black to score enough points in this short tournament to finish in first place.

As a result of his loss to Parmelee, Shelby Lyman finished with a score of $41 / 2$ points and was placed ahead of four other players who mady the same score. In the order of their tie-breaking points, the others were F. S. Nagy of Passaic, N.J., Dr. E. W. Marchand of Rochester, N.Y., George Krauss of Ozone Park, N.Y., and Stanley B. Winters of Newark, N.J.
Close Contest for Women's Title
Eight ladies competed for the women's amateur title. In the fifth round, Kathryn Slater was paired with Ohio's Willa White Owens, USCF Vice-President in charge of promoting chess among women. Mrs. Owens defeated Mrs. Slater and entered the final round half a point ahead of her rival from New York. However, Mrs. Slater won the title by defeating John Ishkan of Fairfield, Conn., while Mrs. Owens lost to Constantine Rasis of Miami Beach, Fla.
Final scores of the eight women players were as follows: Kathryn Slater 3-3; Willa Owens $21 / 2-31 / 2$; Consuelo Rodriguez of Washington, D.C. 2-4; Isabelle Lynne of Washington, D.C., $11 / 2-41 / 2$; Sarah Goodman of New York City 1-5; Rita DeLieto of New York City 1-5; Elizabeth Guala of Westbury, N.Y. 1-5; Lynn Levine of New York City 0-6. In their individual games, Mrs. Owens won from Mrs. Slater; Mrs. Guala and Mrs. DeLieto defeated Miss Levine; Miss Rodriguez and Miss Goodman won from Mrs. DeLieto. Miss Lynne did not play any of the women competitors.

## Trophies for Class Players

Victor A. Guala of the Manhat$\tan$ Chess Club won the trophy awarded to the Chess A player with the highest score. He made a fine showing to finish with 5 points in fourth place. Mr. Guala was rated as an expert in 1954, but indifferent performances in two tournaments early this year brought his average down to 1990 points for the current period. Apparently this young player has now recovered from the effects of his recent mar-
riage and will be able to regain his expert's rank.

The Class B. trophy went to Eugene Salome of New York City, who finished in 11th place with a score of 4-2. Having competed previously in only two minor tournaments at the Manhattan Chess Club, this player had not provided the rating system with enough data to measure his true strength. As a result, he was badly under-rated at 1720 points. We now learn that Salome won important tournaments in Germany before coming to this country. Although he made a very fine showing in strong company, Salome also had a little luck. In a resignable position against Amos Kaminsky in the fifth round, Sa lome salvaged a draw when his opponent blundered by making the only move that could not win the game.

The only other Class B player to score as much as 4 points was F. E. Condon of Bogota, N.J., who finished immediately below Salome in 12th place, having met slightly weaker opponents. Mr. Condon turned in an excellent performance, including a win from U.S. Expert F. Campomanes. Mr. Condon's wife and five children were present to witness his triumph.

## Pairing System Successful

The Amateur Championship was a proving ground for the operation of the new USCF Tournament Rules governing play in a Swiss System tournament. The rules were posted in the tournament room and will be published in CHESS LIFE shortly.

The most important feature of the rules is the method of pairing, which is an improved version of the "Harkness" pairing system used in many tournaments during the past year or two. In the first round of the Amateur Championship, the entrants were ranked in accordance with their last-publish USCF ratings. Players without ratings were placed in alphabetical order at the bottom of the field. For the first round, the top half of the entire field was then matched, in consecutive order, with the bottom half.

The results of the first round confirmed the accuracy of the rating system. The top half of the field won by the convincing score of 33 to 4. Although the bottom half scored four points, this included $31 / 2$ points won by unrated players, the only contestant in the upper half who failed to win was Dr. Marchand who drew with Salome.
By pairing the first round in this manner, all the stronger contestants in the tournament entered the second round with a one-point advantage over the weaker contestants. In effect, the field had been cut in half in the same manner as a knock-out tournament. The pairings in the remaining rounds then made it difficult or impossible for a weak contestant to rise to the topscore groups.
After each succeeding round, the ratings of all players were adjusted to conform with their performances in the previous round. Then the players were ranked in each equal-
their adjusted ratings. The players in the top-half of each group were paired in consecutive order (so far as possible) with the players in the bottom half of their group. At no time was a weak contestant given the opportunity to rise by defeating another weak player.
Although it is almost impossible to develop a winner who has met many strong contenders among 75 players in six rounds, the pairing system succeeded in its main objectives: the development of a single winner as quickly as possible, and the prevention of infiltration by weak players into the top scoring groups. There were eleven players with expert ratings in the tournament and all finished with scores of 4 points or better among the top 18 places. The other seven places were held by five Class A players (including two former experts) and two Class B players.

## Tie Broken by Median System <br> In accordance with the new USCF

 rules, ties were broken by the Median System. Under this system (in a six-round tournament) each player is credited with the scores of all his opponents except the highest and the lowest. Any remaining ties are broken by the total-point system, commonly known in this country as the Solkoff System, each player being credited with the scores of all his opponents. If this method fails to break ties, the S-B system is used. The S-B system is used only as a last resort because it is the most inefficient. Actually, of course, tie not broken by the Median System itself should not be broken; but there is always an element of luck in a Swiss tournament, so there is no harm in allowing Lady Luck to take charge of breaking ties when other methods fail.
## Wives and Kids Enjoy Sports

There were no "chess widows" at the Amateur Championship. Many of the players brought their wives and children along to enjoy a week-end in the country. While Poppa was playing chess, Momma and the kids were playing tennis, swimming or wading in Lake Mohegan, sun-bathing, rowing boats and otherwise taking advantage of the splendid sports facilities of the Mohegan Country Club. Motor-boats scurried to and fro on the lake, pulling behind them youthful enthusiasts on water-skis. In the evenings, the ladies played bridge, ping-pong and other indoor sports, or watched the television set. of course, a few of the more dutiful wives looked in occasionally to see how their spouses were faring in the chess tournament.

The weather was ideal and everybody had a grand time. Practically all the players, together with wives, children, and some visitors stayed at the Mohegan Country Club. The tournament was held in a big Casino at the edge of the lake. Although the contestants were kept busy playing chess, many found time between rounds to engage in other sports.

Coess life
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all its facilities were made available to the USCF by the courtesy of Mr. Morris Kramer of the London Terrace Chess Club, New York, and his associates, Mr. and Mrs. David Harris of Lake Mohegan. In response to many requests by the players and their families, another tournament will probably be held at the Mohegan Country Club in September of this year.
Mr. and Mrs. Max Pavey were present throughout the tournament. Max was the official adjudicator and decided the results of games unfinished after four hours of play. Fortunately, there were only a few games that had to be adjudicated. The most critical was the last-round game between Harry Lyman and Frank S. Nagy, when the former needed a win to tie Parmelee. It was a draw.
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## USCF CO-SPONSORSHIP OF USA-USSR MATCH AT MOSCOW

## Dear Mr. Hearst:

This is a formal reply to your letter of March 24, 1955, which was publlshed the Chess Life issue of April 20.

It should serve to explain to the members of USCF the motivation which has prompted the International Affairs Committee to decide to grant the chess match between the U.S. and

When I joined the USCF it was with one central purpose in mind. I had deided from my own experience and observation, that the interests of chess In this country would best be served by the existence of a chess federation with a large membership which could by its own exertion support chess events of both a national and international character. Whereas chess patrons could be encouraged to initiate and support events of their own choosing, these should be supplementary to a vigorous program of chess activities financed and directed by the U.S. Chess Federation Itself.

I have not abandoned this desire. However, in the years of my membership it has become obvious that the time is not yet here when this desire can be fulfilled. IF EACH OF US ACTIVELY RECRUITS MORE MEMBERS, SO THAT OUR MEMBERSHIP IS RAISED TO 5 OR 10 TIMES THE PRESENT NUMBER, MATTERS WOULD BE DIFFERENT. THIS IS A MATTER FOR THE FUTURE WHICH I
PRESENT WITH ALL EARNESTNESS TO MY FELLOW MEMBERS IN THE USCF.

At the present time, it is clear that all large scale events of the nature of international matches must be financed by private patrons If they are to materialize at all. Ideally, patrons should simply give us the appropriate funds for a given project such as the match with USSR to use as we see fit. In actuality, this is a quixotic dream. Most of us are agreed that these matches are of interest to all lovers of chess. What should be the role of the USCF?

At Milwaukee in 1953, I stafed that whereas such events should be encouraged by the USCF, we should nevertheless withhold sponsorship if such sponsorship would involve violation of any of our principles. Consequently, when the International Affairs committee was created Under the chairmanship of william
Byland, I ENTHUSIASTICALLY ENDORSED THE PRINCIPLE WHICH WAS ByIand,
ADOPTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE AND WHICH WAS PRESENTED TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS IN AUG. 1954, THAT "ALL FUTURE UNITED STATES TEAMS, IN INTERNATIONAL COMPETITION, SHOULD
BE COMPOSED OF THE UNITED STATES CHAMPION AND THE HIGHEST
RANKED AVAILABLE PLAYERS, IN ORDER, FROM THE CURRENT NATIONAL RANKED AVAILABLE PLAYERS, IN ORDER, FROM THE CURRENT NATIONAL RATING LIST". This principle would have to be followed before USCF would grant sponsorship to any international team matches.

On Dec. 28, 1954, I wrote my first letter as the new chairman of the International Affairs Committee to the other members of the committee. On the subject of "Selection of Members of Team to Play in Moscow", 1 wrote:
"I, personally, wish to adhere to our rule of determination of team
personnel by the current rating list. By current list, I mean the list published just prior to the time of organizing the team.

In my view, the members of the USCF THROUGHOUT THE COUNTRY MUST HAVE THE ASSURANCE THAT THEY HAVE POSSIBILITY TO
REPRESENT THE U.S.A. AS A CONSEQUENCE OF THEIR OWN ACHIEVEREPRESENT THE U.S.A. AS A CONSEQUENCE OF THEIR OWN ACHIEVE-
MENTS ALONE AND ENTIRELY INDEPENDENT OF THE VIEWS OR OPINIONS OF AN INDIVIDUAL OR GROUP OF INDIVIDUALS. THE SELECTION SHOULD BE
SUBJECTIVE OPINIONS.
"WHY HOLD A SPECIAL TOURNAMENT FOR THE REMAINING PLACES? HOW MANY PLAYERS CAN AFFORD THE TIME TO PLAY IN
SUCH A TOURNAMENT AS WELL AS IN MOSCOW? FOr example, R. SUCH A TOURNAMENT AS WELL AS IN MOSCOW? For example, R.
Byrne had to withdraw from the Rosenwald Tournament and D. Byrne could not find time to play in the U.S. Championship. THE REALITIES OF U.S. CHESS LIFE PRECLUDE SUCH TRIAL TOURNAMENTS even If they could prove something. In my view, a single tournament proves little
about the absolute strength of a player. We have all seen that a player may do poorly in one tournament and do brilliantly in the next, or vice versa. A player's rating is a much better guide, than a single tournament since it represents his average performance over a period of years."
In addition, a tournament to decide members of a team would also involve financial expenses to the players including cost of transportation and room and board for all players who live outside the city where the tournament would be
held. HOW MANY PLAYERS COULD AFFORD TO SPEND THIS MONEY ON THE held. HOW MANY PLAYERS COULD AFFORD TO SPEND THIS MONEY ON THE
CHANCE THAT THEY MIGHT PLACE HIGH ENOUGH TO BE PUT ON THE TEAM?

Why did I advocate strict use of the rating list? The use of the rating list represents to me the fairest and best method of evaluating chess ability. The method of personal opinion is extremely precarious. First, even the best players differ in their opinion of the various players. Personal likes and dislikes enter into their iudgment, either consciously or sub-consciously, even with the best of intentions. In addition, players have preferences for certain styles, and so do all other persons who might be consulted about the team line-up. Besides, no given individual really knows all the players very well. From the standpoint of the Federation which must stand on the principle of fair play to all, no other method is conceivable, in my view. As a matter of fact the rating system has been a unifying concept around which all the members have rallied.

1 still believe that an audited rating list with its possible shortcomings is the best guide for team selection.

It should be noted that the Russians conducted their negotiations for the forthcoming match through Mr. A. Bisno, who is the head of the private patrons committee.

At the conclusion of the Lessing Rosenwald tournament in the beginning of Jan. 1955, I aftended a meeting with the patrons of the forthcoming USA-USSR match. At that time, I insisted on the principle of use of the rating list as a condition of USCF sponsorship. Thereafter, Mr. Bisno wrote me from California for the list of the first 15 players on the list. Mr. Harkness was unable to give me the names, but promised them in a month. More than 2 months later, by the middle of March, Mr. Harkness was still unable to furnish the rating list, due to the pressure of other matters. The patrons then decided on their own team which filled all the places outside of second alternate.

The Selection Committee of the patrons of this match decided to hold a quadrangular tournament to decide the place of 2nd alternate. When the names of the four participants, Kevitz, Sherwin, Lombardy, and Lasker, became known, a number of masters protested the arbitrariness of the selection. I tried to have
the terms of the tournament for 2nd alternate amended without success. Actually
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if Kevitz or Sherwin had been arbitrarily chosen by the patrons without a quadrangular tournament there probably would not have been so much controversy. The quadrangular started before Mr. Harkness released names of first 16 players.

As a matter of fact the actual team is astonishingly close to the forthcoming rating list. All 10 players on the team are within the first 16 on the latest rating list.
OUR INABILITY TO FURNISH A CURRENT RATING LIST SUFFICIENTLY EARLY MADE IT IMPOSSIBLE TO INSIST ON THE PRINCIPLE OF THE RATING LIST OR ANY OTHER METHOD OF SELECTION. Even the method which Eliot Hearst and a group of masters recommended is predicated on having a current rating list from which to select players who would have to participate in a tournament.

In the light of all the above circumstances to withhold sponsorship would lay us open to the reasonable charge of perversely obstructing a match which is of great interest to all lovers of chess.

The members of the Ways and Means Committee and the members of the International Affairs Committee have agreed to co-sponsor the forthcoming USAUSSR match.
think that to avoid similar incidents in the future,

1. We must have a current rating list.

We must inform all foreign chess federations (Russia, Argentina, Sweden, Holland, efc.) that they must contact and negotiate all international chess matters through me as Chairman of the International Affairs Comimittee of the USCF, or through Mr. F. Graves, President, USCF.
3. We must increase membership in the USCF.

MAX PAVEY

Dear Mr. Pavey:
Your reply to our protest presents in a clear fashion precisely the reasons why the USCF should not sponsor the forthcoming USSR-USA international match-and yet your final decision is in favor of sponsorship!

You note that (1) "team selection should be based on objective means and not on subiective opinions" and (2) the national rating list should be followed right down the line in team selection "as the fairest and best method of evaluating chess ability." Certainly none of us could disagree with these principles and our original suggestion of a tourney to determine the last five or six places on the team (Grandmasters and Senior Masters automatically being chosen) was in reality a concession to those who over-estimate the shortcomings of the present rating system. Doubtless, following the rating system man-for-man is the prest objective system. Doubtiess, following the rating system man-for-man ins the most objective
method possible, although the rating system should continually be reexamined method possible, although the rating system should continually be reexamined

You state that Mr. Harkness was unable to furnish current ratings which might be used in the choice of team personnel. While this delay in calculation of ratings is indeed regrettable and should be avoided in the future, the fact remains that the last previous rating list was only a year old and certainly presented a more objective and democratic standard for team selection than the subjective opinions of a few judges. Incidentally, the current ratings you requested were made available at the end of March, surely in sufficient time or the nomination of team members to go to Moscow in late June.

The principal specific objection voiced in our original letter was the choice of players to compete in the so-called Quadrangular qualifying tournament. No one (literally) with whom any of us has discussed this tourney has understood the method of selecting the four participants and there can be no doubt that the Quadrangular tournament will remain as an example of manifest injustice. You yourself indicate agreement on this point when you comment that you "tried to have the terms of the tourney amended without success." And yet you are willing to attach Federation sponsorship to a match which utilized such a means of selection, even though sufficient time remained to declare the tourney invalid as far as the USCF was concerned and to recommend a more democratic ournament in its place.

You indicate that the "withholding of sponsorship by the USCF would lay it open to the reasonable charge of perversely obstructing a match which is of great interest to all lovers of chess." This is hardly a cogent reason for acceding to sponsorship for it is well known that the match would have taken place with or without the Federation's stamp of approval; the Russians had already told the organizers of the match that USCF sponsorship was of no importance as far as they were concerned. There was thus no necessity for the USCF to abandon its
principles in order that the match be possible; it would have occurred anyway.

Finally, we must point out that a Federation decision not to sponsor the match would have been taken as a sign of strength after such a long series of concessions to private patrons. Rather than the patrons being those who decide the system used to select team members, it should be the USC. which sets up minimal requirements for sponsorship of events invoiving without which requirements no event can receive Federation sponsorship. The wonetary and organizational support of interested patrons is necessary and should be encouraged, but not to the extent of granting them complete freedom in matters involving the USCF.

We regret that the USCF did not take a more vigorous stand in this matter and we hope that in any future events of a similar nature it will at the outset make it clear what the conditions of sponsorship will be.

> SIDNEY N. BERNSTEIN

JEREMIAH F. DONOVAN,
ELIOT HEARST,
CARL PILNICK Life Director USCF HERBERT SEIDMAN
GEORGE SHAINSWIT

Columbus Y (Ohio) Chess Club: Ger-
ard Platau was elected president, Kurt Loening vice-president, Tim Anderson
secretary, and Charles McCracken, Jr. secretary, and Charles McCracken, Jr.
treasurer. James Schroeder became
tournament and match director, and Erwin Underwood editor of Caissa, the club publication. A USCF Afflilated Club.

Chess Life, are at regular rates (see above) for first membership, at the followIng rates for each additional membership; One year $\$ 2.50$; two years $\$ 4.75$; three years $\$ 6.75$. Subscription rate of Chess Life to non-members is $\$ 3.00$ per year. Single copies 15 c each.
CHANGE OF ADDRESS: Four weeks notice required. When ordering change please furnish an address stencil impression from recent issue or exact reproduction, including numbers and dates on top line.
Send membershlp dues (or subseriptions) and changes of address to KENNETH
HARKNESS, Business Manager, 81 Bedford Street, New York 14, $\mathbf{N}$. Send tournament rating reports (with fees, if any) and all communications ree
garding CHESS LiFE edinorial matters to MONTGOMERY MAJOR, Editor, 18,
North Humphrey Avenue, Oak Park, Hi.
Make all checks payable to: THE UNITED STATES CHESS FEDERATION


# LARRY EVANS ON OPENINGS 

## By International Master LARRY EV ANS

U. S. OPEN CHAMPION, 1954

## From My Chess Notebooks

## MERAN DEFENSE

Some time ago, in reviewing the Rosenwald Tournament, the Kra-mer-Bisguier game called the following variation to our attention. (PCO p. 208, col. 144): 1. P-Q4, P-Q4; 2. P-QB4, P-QB3; 3. N-KB3, N-B3; 4. N-B3, P-K3; 5. P-K3, QN-Q2; 6. B-Q3, PxP; 7. BxBP, P-QN4; 8. B-Q3, P.QR3; 9. P-K4, P-B4; 10. P-K5, PxP; 11. $N \times N P, N \times K P$ (because of the present suggestion, this move may have to be abandoned); 12. $\mathbf{N x N}$, PxN; 13 Q-B3 (not 13. BxPch, B-Q2; 14. NxB, Q-R4ch!), B-N5ch; 14. KQ11? This move was first called to my attention because of the inadequacy of Kramer's 14. K-B1, and the artificiality of the "book" 14 . K-K2.


Position after 14 K-Q11?
Now 14. ........ R-QN1?; is no longer playable after 15 . Q-N3, and if 15. Q-B2; 16. QxNP, QxN (White need not fear this move with check, since his King is no longer on K2; nor need he fear mate on K8, since his King is no longer on B1); 17. Qx Rch, K-K2 (or ........, K-Q2); 18. Q-N7 B-N2; 19. B-N5, and White wins.

Now forced is 14. ........, Q-Q4; 15. QxQ, NxQ; 16. BxPch, K-K2; 17. Bx Pch, K-K2; and there are all sorts of interesting possibilities, though White's King would be better placed on K2 for the ending. He might continue with 18. N-B6ch, K-Q3; 19. NxP, K-B4; 20. B-B6 (he does no longer fear 20.

B-R3ch since the King is not on K2, as it would be in the main line), R-any; 21. BxN, winning a Pawn, albeit risky. However, White can continue more safely with 19. NxB, NxN; 20. P-QR3, with two Bishops and 2 passed Pawns on the Q-side.

It would be very interesting to see this new move 14. K-Q1!? given a practical test. If good, it means that Black will have to relinquish 11. ......., NxKP; and play 11. PxN. If bad-well, that's the way new ideas are born.

## GRUENFELD DEFENSE

There are those of us still unconvinced by the "refutation" which was unveiled in the Bronstein-Boleslavsky match game: 1. P-Q4, NKB3;2. P-QB4, P-KN3; 3. N-QB3,

P-Q4; 4. PxP, $N \times P$; 5. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{NxN}$; 6. PxN, P-QB4; 7. B-QB4, B-N2; 8. N-K2, O-O; 9. O-O, PxP; 10. PxP, N-B3; 11. B-K3, B-N5; 12. P-B3, N-R4; 13. B-Q3, B-K3; 14, P-Q5, BxR; 15. QxB, P-B3;


A recent game from Mar Del Plata, 1955, between the name player, Gligorich (White) and the unknown, Idigoras (Black), ended in an upset. The play continued: 16. K-R1 (the fashionable continuation, also tried in Sherwin-Gross, US Open, 1954), B-Q2; 17. P-K5, R-B1; 18. B-KR6, R-K1; 19. N-B4, N-B5; 20. P-K6, B-R5; 21. Q-K1, N-K4; 22. Q-N3, Q-Q3; 23. B-K4, B-B7; 24. P-KR4, K-R1; and White could make no headway. He finally lost.

## GRUENFELD DEFENSE

( MCO $^{8}$ p. 80 col. 2 note g)
Addenda to MCO: 1. P-Q4, N-KB3; 2. P-QB4, P-KN3; 3. N-QB3, P-Q4; 4. $P \times P, N \times P ; 5 . P-K 4, N \times N ; 6 . P \times N$, P-QB4; 7. B-QB4, B-N2; 8. N-K2, $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3 ;$ 9. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 1$ 10. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Q}$ R4ch; 11. B-Q2, Q-R6; 12. R-N1! End of analysis. White may indeed have the advantage, but the position contains the following cute trap: 12.
$\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$; and if 13 . O-O, P-QR4; and Black probably has equality because of his play against White's center. This has never received a tournament test, however, because it has been thought that White wins the Queen by 13. P-Q5?, N-K4; 14. B-N4. However Harry Feldheim, of New York, suggests 14. ......., Q-B6!!; winning at least a Pawn.


Of course not 15. PxQ??, NxPch; 16. K-B1, B-R6 mate! After 15. O-O, QxKP; wins for Black anyway.

## RUY LOPEZ

MCO contains no convincing refutation to the following variation of the Marshall Attack: 1. P-K4, PK4; 2. N-KB3, N-QB3; 3. B-N5, PQR3; 4. B-R4, N-B3; 5. O-O, B-K2; 6. R-K1, P-QN4; 7. B-N3, O-O; 8. P-B3, P-Q4; 9. PxP, P-K5!?; 10. PxN, PxN; 11. $\mathbf{Q x P}$ (p. 249, col. 99, note 1), B-KN5; 12. Q-N3, R-K1; 13. P-KB4, B-Q3;


The analysis now gives 14. R-K5! (which in reality deserves a ?), which should lose to 14 . ... 15. PxB, N-R4; 16. QxB, RxP; and the ultimate check on K8 should prove fatal to White.
The correct defense, however, is 14. P-Q4!, and if N-R4; 15. RxRch, QxR; 16. Q-B2, QxP (best); 17. B-K3, followed by N-Q2, and R-K1-Black has nothing for the Pawn.
It is against 14. R-K5? that Weaver Adams alleges his refutation of the entire Ruy Lopez!

Pennsylvania State University Chess Club defeated Gettysburg College $81 / 2$ $11 / 2$ in a double round match to cinch the Central Pennsylvania college title, and will meet the winner of the Eastern Division in May for the State title. In the match with Gettysburg, Kalodner, Friedman and Kerr scored two points, Dejaiffe $11 / 2$ and Eilberg 1, while for Gettysburg Miller salvaged a point and Strang a half-point.
Marshall (N.Y.) Chess Club: James Gore tallied 13-1, drawing twice with Sidney Zarkin, to win the Marshall Junior Championship. Zarkin was second with $121 / 2-11 / 2$, drawing also with Jack Beers; and John Kirwan and Jack Beers tied for third in the 8-player double round robin with $8-6$ each. A USCF Affiliated Club.

## WORLD JUNIOR CHAMPIONSHIP TRAVEL FUND

Contributions are sollcited for a
travel fund to travel fund to send a quallified repreionship Tournament at Antwerp, Belionship Tournament at Antwe
gium this July 20 -August 5 .
Please forward your contributlons, marked "For Junior Travel Fund" to:

KENNETH HARKNESS
USCF Business Manager
81 Bedford St. New York 13, N.Y.

# 16TH USSR WOMEN'S CHESS CHAMPIONSHIP <br> <br> By PAUL LEITH, 

 <br> <br> By PAUL LEITH,}

## Guest Columnist

THE recent 16th USSR Women's Chess Championship indicates what Mrs. Gisela K. Gresser, Mrs. Sonja Graf Stevenson and Miss Mona May Karff will be up against at the Women's World Challengers Tournament in Moscow this October.

The winner among twenty contestants was twenty-nine year old Larissa Wolpert of Leningrad, with 14 points; she won her games against the next five contenders. A close sccond was Yuzefa Gurfinkel of Rostov-on-the-Don, a half point behind. Mrs. Olga Rubtzova of Moscow was third ( 12 points.) And then a triple tie for 4 th ( $111 / 2$ points) between World Champion Elizabeta Bykova, Tatania Zatulovskaya of Baku, and last year's USSR champion, Katrina Zvorkina. Mrs. Ludmilla Rudenko, winner of the women's world championship in 1950, in second place in last year's USSR championship, dropped to a tie for tenth place.

Our representatives will thus have to face new blood, younger players who have beaten those who were outstanding in former world's challenger tournaments.

Those interested in the development of women's chess in our country should note particularly, in connection with the 16 th Tournament: (1) That top players no longer come exclusively from the big cities like Moscow and Leningrad. (2) That younger players are coming to the fore, like Tatania Zatulovskaya, only 19 years old, who tied for 4th place on her first appearance in a national tournament, and who won her games against experienced players like Rudenko, Rubtzova and Zvorkina. (3) That a great many women took part in the preliminaries. In the semi-finals, there were four groups, with fourteen players in each, meeting in different cities. According to the monthly magazine "Chess in the USSR," twelve thousand women in the Russian Republic alone took part in the preliminaries of the previous tournament (the 15th); and over a thousand in the city of Rostov-on-theDon.

Yes, our women's chess trio will indeed face stiff competition from the winners of the 16 th USSR Women's Championship Tournament.
Thank you, Mr. Leith, for the very interesting and informative column. Nu merically, the U.S. is a little short of matching Russid's 12,000 women tournament players-about 11,800 short. However, I am assured on high international authority, that qualitatively, we can match the top Russian women players. It is zuite possible that one of our players will win the right to challenge Bykova for the World Title next year. W.O.

# GAMES BY USCF MEMBERS 

Annotated by Chess Master JOHN W. COLLINS, Marshall Chess Club Champion, 1954

USCF MEMBERS: Submit your best games for this department to JOHN W. COLLINS, $91_{n}$ Lenox Road, Brooklyn 26, N.Y. Space being limited, Mr. Collins will relect the most interesting and instructive for publication. Unless otherwise stated notes to games are by Mr. Collins.

AN INTERESTING SUB-VARIATION OF THE HOWELL ATTACK

White's reluctance to take a duay after his attack has been turned back does nothing to detract from the interest of this variation.

## RUY LOPEZ

MCO: page 240, column 56 (b) ICCF Individual Tourney Correspondence, 1954-55 Notes by Dr. M. G. Sturm
White
ARNE ERICSON
(Sweden)
DR. M. G. STURM

1. $\mathrm{K}+\mathrm{K} 4 \mathrm{KB3}$ P-K4 $\quad$ 6. P-Q4 $\begin{array}{r}\text { (Trinidad) } \\ \text { P-QK } 44\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}\text { 2. } & \text { Kt-KB3 } & \text { Kt-QB3 } & \text { 7. } & \text { B-Kt3 } & \text { P-Q4 } \\ \text { 3. } & \text { B-Kts } & \text { P-QR3 } & \text { 8. } & \text { PXP } & \text { B-K3 }\end{array}$

| 4. | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R} 4$ | Kt -B3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 5. | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | KtrP |

The Howell Attack, enhanced by successful use at the World Championship Tournament 1948
9. $\quad$ B-K2 ${ }^{10}$ 10. P-B4 $\quad$ Kt-B4! Recommended by Keres.
11. PXQP!!

Keres gives only 11. PxKtP, KtxB; 12. PxKt, PxP; 13. RxR, QxR; 14. QxP, O-O. The text seems to give at least a forced draw against any analysis. White gets a terrific attack for a R, which Black apparently must take, or be worse off.

 13. PxPch 14. P-K6ch K-Kt1 18. Kt-B7 P-KR4! With the intention of returning the R and reaching a dead level position. | 19. Q-Kt6 | Kt-Q4 | 23. KtxR | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B5}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| K |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { 20. } \mathrm{Kt}+3-\mathrm{K4} & \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B2} & \text { 24. } \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B5} & \begin{array}{r}\mathrm{KxKt} \\ \text { 21. } \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt5}\end{array} \\ \mathrm{KtxP} & \text { 25. } \mathrm{QxKt} & \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB1}\end{array}$ 22. BxB Q×B 26. Q-K3 R-K1 The situation as foreseen with the anticipation of 27. RxKt and a draw. 27. P-B3?

Weakening his K -side against central pressure. White should take the draw. (See note above).

| 27. | Kt -87 | 32. Q-R5 | K2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 28. Q-B3 | Q-R2ch | 33. Kt-K4 | Kt-K+5! |
| 29. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B5}$ | R-K4 | 34. P-KR3 | Kt-Q6 |
| 30. K-RI | Kt-K6 | 35. R-B1 | Kt-B5 |

$\begin{array}{llll}\text { 30. K-R1 } & \text { Kt-K6 } & \text { 35. R-B1 } & \text { Kt-B5 } \\ \text { 3t-Q4 } & \text { 36. } \mathrm{Q} \text {-RP } & \text { Q-K111 }\end{array}$
"Attack is the best defense" (Emmanuel "Attack is the best defense" (Emmanuel
Lasker), but it is unusual to see a move Lasker), but it is unusual to see a move
that really does both. $37 . . . . . .$, Q-Kt3! is threatened.
37. R-B1 Q-K+3I

Decisive.
38.P-KK 14
and wins.


## PERSONAL SERVICE

The Editor of this Department will play you a game by-mail, comment on every move, and give you a thorough postgame analysis. Fee $\$ 10$.

Mr. Collins will also annotate any one of your games for a fee of $\$ 5$.
(hess Cife
Sunday, Page 6 June 5, 1955

## FORGING THE WIN

White forges the win with an advanced Pawn, a penetrative Bishop and Knight, a lateral development of the King Rook, the disrupting of Black's king. side Pawns, and a mating attack.

## NIMZO-INDIAN DEFENSE

MCO: page 110, column (a) (A)
California Open Championship Santa Barbara, 1954
White
J. SCHMITT J. Black

1. P-Q4 $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3 \quad$ 3. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3 \quad \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K}+5$ 2. P-QB4 P-K3 4. P-K3 This is the popular Rubinstein Variation of the Nimzo-Indian Defense. 4 Q-Kt3, once a favorite, is still a reliable alternative.
Preferable to this mixing of the Queen's and Nimzo Indian Defenses are 4 . ........ O-O; 4. ....... P-Q4; and 4. ........, P-B4
To avoid doubled QBPs.

> 5. P-QR3

## B-K+2

A concession, yet 6. ........, BxKt ch; cedes the minor exchange without any compensation. 7 P. P5!
An advance into the enemy camp which nullifies the effectiveness of the fianchettoed Bishop.
7.
To prevent P-QKt4 for a bit. On 7.

O-O; and 7......., P-Q3; White also se cures a slight advantage.

P-Q3

The desire to challenge the dominating White QP is instinctive, but a more restrained, sounder approach is 9 . ........, P-K4; 10. ......., O-O; and 11. ......., QKt. P-K4
Q2.
10.

## 10. P-K4 <br> $\begin{array}{llll}\text { 11. BPXP BPXP } & \text { 13. Kt-B5 } & \text { O-O }\end{array}$

 12. B-K+5ch
## QKt-Q2

White develops, increases the tension, and threatens to break Black's kingand threatens to break Black's king-
side with 15. KtxBch, QxKt; 16. KBxKt, side with 15 . Ktx
QxBx; 17. BxKt.

If 14. ...... KtxQP? 15. KtxB ch, KtxKt;
16. QxP, P-B3; 17. BxKt, PxB; 18. B-K6 16. QxP, P-B3; 17. BxKt, PxB; 18. B-K6
ch, K-R1; 19. QxKP, advances White's cause.
15. P-KR4

This avoids any threats to the QP (because it guards the QB) and signals a king-side attack,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 15. } \mathrm{K}+\mathrm{BBch} \\
& \text { 16. } \\
& \text { 17. } \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 6
\end{aligned}
$$

## B-B1 Q×K +

Having penetrated with the KKt, and gained the Two Bishops thereby, White now does likewise with the KB. One idea behind the move is to entice Black's Bishop off its B1-R6 diagonal. Black's Bishop off its B1-R6 B-R3
17. ......., B-Kt2; at once or 17. Better 17. ......., B-Kt2; at once or 17.
......, R-Kt1. 18. R-R3!

side attack. Black obtains counterplay with 18. BxR, Kt-Q6 ch; 19, K-Q2, Ktx KtP ; 20. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5 \mathrm{ch}$; 21. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 1$, RxB. Better 18

## 18. ......... QR-Kt1.

Otherwise White just goes ahead and wins with 20. P-R5, 21. P-R6, and 22. PXP.
20. BxKt
20. BxKt

Threatening the BP.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 21. } \ldots \ldots \text {. } \mathrm{P} \text {. } \\
& \text { 22. } \mathrm{PxP} \\
& \text { R×R }
\end{aligned}
$$

If 23. ......., Kt-R3; 24. P-Kt5, wins. And if 23. ...... R-R1; 24. Q-B1, Kt-Kt6; 25. QxP, R-R8 ch; 26. Kt-Q1 (threatening 27. R-Kt3 ch), wins. But the text is a loser too because it gives a passed-pawn and lets in the Knight.
If 24. $\mathbf{P x B} \quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}+6$
If 24. ......, Kt-K3; 25. Kt-Q5, wins.

$$
\text { 25. } Q \cdot Q
$$

Kt-Q5

> Kt-Q5 $\mathbf{K} \cdot \mathbf{R 1}$
25. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K}+3 \mathrm{ch}$

If $26, \ldots \ldots$, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 2$; 27 . Q-Kt4, also wins.
27. Q-Kt4 Kt-K3 29. Kt-Q5 Q-Q1 28. Q-RS K-R2 30, P-B7 or 30. Q-B5 ch, K-R1; 31. KtxBP, winning the Queen.

| 30. <br> 31. Q -B5ch <br> 3. Ktx | K+xP <br> K-R1 |
| :---: | ---: |
| Resigns |  |

VIENNA OPENING
MCO: page 307
Yale vs. Columbia
Radio Match, 1955

Notes by Michael Wertheim

## White WERTHE <br> WERTHEIM <br> (Yale)

$\begin{array}{llll}\begin{array}{lll}\text { (Yale) } \\ \text { 1. P-K4 }\end{array} & \text { P-K4 } & \text { 3. B-B4 } & \begin{array}{c}\text { WILSON } \\ \text { (Columbia) }\end{array}\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { 1. } & \text { P-K4 } & \text { P-K4 } & \text { 3. } & \text { B-B4 } \\ \text { 2. } & \text { Kt-QB3 } & \mathrm{Kt} \text {-KB3 } & \text { 4. } & \mathrm{Kt}+\mathrm{B3}\end{array}$
2. Kt-QB3 Kt-KB3 4. Kt-B3

The Boden-Kieseritzky Gambit.
The correct defense is 5 . The correct defense is 5 . ......., P-KB3!, after which Black can hold the pawn. 6. K+xP

Forced.
7. Q-R5

Seems forci
KtxKtP, PxKt. If 7. ......., P-KKt3?; 8. Q-R5 Q-R5 ch, K-Kt1; 11. B-Q3, P-KB4; 12. BxP wins outright. If 7. ......, P-Q4; White can get a R and two Ps for a Kt and a B by 8. KtxBP. RxKt; 9. BxP, Q-K1; 10. BXR ch.
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { 8. O-O } & \text { P.Q3 } & \text { 10. R-K1 } & \text { Kt-B3 }\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { 8. } & \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q3} & \text { I0. } \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K1} \\ \text { 9. } & \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B3} & \mathrm{KT}-\mathrm{Q} 2 & \text { II. } \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4!\end{array}$
Pinning the Knight because of the inadequately defended Bishop (if 10......., Kt -Q4; 12. (2-K4).
$\begin{array}{lll}11 . & \text { 12. B-Q3 }\end{array}$
Again pinning the Knight and threatAgain pinning the Knight and
12. ...... $\quad$ R-K1 13. B-KK $\dagger 5$ P-KR3

Black's best was 13. ........ B-K3; when after 14. BxKt, BxB; 15. QxP ch White after 14. BxKt, BxB; 15.
has to settle for a pawn. has to se
14. BxP!


For after 14. ......., PxB; 15. QxP, Black is threatened by Kt-Kt5 follewed by $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R} 7 \mathrm{ch}$, forcing mate.
${ }_{\text {14. }}{ }^{\text {B-R7 }} \mathrm{ch}$, forcing ma
 If 14. ....... Kt-R2; 15. BxKt ch and if
14. ......, Kt-Kt5; 15. B-KKt5 with White winning material in both cases.

Necessary to stop mate.
16. R×B! R×R
16. RXB!
If. $16 ., \ldots$-QB4!,$~ K t x R ; ~ 17 . ~ B-B 6 ~ f o r c e s ~ m a t e . ~$
Resigns

Resigns
White gets at least $\mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B}$, and P for
a $R$ and retains a winning attack.

## QUIET FURY

Pilnick plays his favorite "Smyslov" line against Denker's Sicilian, a quiet positional line. When his opponent plays sereral premature opening moves and then errs on the 15th turn, Pilnick unleashes a furious attack which carries the day.

## SICILIAN DEFENSE

## MCO: page 291, column 131

Metropolitan League Match
New York, 1955
Notes by U.S. Master
Dr. Harold Sussman
White
A. Black
c. PILNICK
A. S. DENKER (Marshall C.C.)
(Manhattan C.C.) $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { 1. P-K4 } & \text { P-QB4 } & \text { (4. } & \text { B-Kł2 } & \text { B-Kł2 } \\ \text { 1. } & \text { Kt-QB3 } & \text { Kt-QB3 } & \text { 5. } & \text { P.Q3 }\end{array}$ 2. Kt -QB3 Kt -QB3 Probably best. Playable alternatives are 5. ......., P-Q3 followed by 6. ......., P-K4 and 5. ........, P-QKt3 with 6. ........., B-Kt2 ensuing.
6. B-K3 Kt-Q5

Premature. This Knight should move to Q5 only after White's KKt plays to K2, after which it is difficult to dislodge. Standard is 6. ......., Q-R4!

## . QKt-K2!

Very strong. The less accurate 7. KKtK2 is countered by 7. ......., Q-R4 and Black stands well. After the text Black must swap Kts or be driven away with considerable loss of time.
7. ........ P-Q4

This is new but looks unappetizing. Of course, 7. ......., KtxKt; 8. KtxKt, BxP; 9. R-Kt1, B-Kt2 (best); 10. BxP favors White. Perhaps Denker expected 8 . BxKt, PxB; 9. PxP, PxP and thought his two Bishop game plus the open $K$ and QB files would compensate for the weak doubled pawns. The better 7 .
P-Q3; 8. P-QB3, KtxKt; 9. KtxKt still affords White a clear advantage.
affords
$8 . \quad$ P-B3
The simplest way to retain the better game as it keeps Black's counter-play to a minimum.
8. KtxK…. 9. KtxK P-Q4, he had P-Q5 in mind at this point It would lose a pawn by 10 . PxP, PxP; 11. KtxP, BxKt; 12. Q-R4 ch! and 13 . QxB, ete.
10. BxQBP
Far stronger than the prosaic 10. PxP.

## 10th U. S. JUNIOR CHAMPIONSHIP <br> July 15-24, 1955 <br> Lincoln, Nebraska

Eligibilify: All chess players in North America who are not yet 21 years old at date tournament starts.

Place: The air-conditioned Green Room of the Lincoln YMCA.
Type: Swiss tournament; William Bergsten tournament director.
Entry fees: No entry fees, but entrants must be or become USCF members ( $\$ 5.00$ dues).
Registrations: Entries should be mailed to A. Liepnieks, 135 No. 14th Street, Lincoln, Neb. or to Kenwood Opp, 2112 So. 9th Street, Lincoln, Neb.
Prizes: First prize will be an article of $\$ 75$ cash value, and approximately 10 prizes will be awarded.
Accomodations: Free board and room will be available for a limited number of applicants. Otherwise rooms will be available at YMCA for $\$ 1.00$ per day.

## GUEST ANNOTATORS

## Dr. Harold Sussman <br> Dr. M. G. Sturm

Michael Wertheim

PxP
Or 10. ........, QxP and White has the pleasant choice of 11. Q-R4 ch, B-Q2; 12. QxKP, QxQ; 13. BxQ or 11. Q-Kt3, $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ (if 11. ......., P-KB4; 12. R-Q1, Q-R3; 13. R-Q6 is too strong); 12. Q-R3 with a powerful attack for the pawn.
11. Kt-B4 Q-B2

After 11. ......., P-Q7 ch; 12. QxP, QxQ ch; 13. KxQ White's ending is. too strong.
12. Ktyp

This maneuver isn't sufficient but a fully satisfactory line is hard to find. my recommendation is 12 .
 $\begin{array}{ll}\text { 13. } \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K}+3 \mathrm{l} & \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 3 \\ \text { 14. } \mathrm{BXB} & \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}\end{array}$


This is a decisive error. The necessary play is 15 . ......, O-O-O! bringing more safety to his King and supporting his QKtP. White said he would reply 16. Q-B2. In that case 16. ......., P-QKt3; 17. B-R3, Kt-KR3 leaves Black with an inferior position but with good practical chances for successful survival.

## 16. KR-K1

This appears to win in all variations and is what Denker overlooked. He now
paused for almost 45 minutes to ponder his continuation. If 16 . ......, RxKt; 17. RxR, QxB; 18. QxKtP (it is now clear why 15 . ......., O-O-O was stronger than R-Q1) and Black faces a dilemma. If 18. ........ Kt-K2 (or Kt-KB3); 19. Q-Q7 ch, K-B1; 20. Q-Q8 mates. On 18. Q-Kt3; 19. Q-B8 ch, K-K2; 20. R-Q7 ch, K-B3; 21. Q-K8, Kt-R3; 22. Q-K7 ch, K-B4; 23. P-KB4 and White should win easily; i.e., if 23. ......., B-B3; 24. R-K5 ch, BxR; 1.e., Q-Kt5 ch, K-K5; 26. QxB ch, K-B6; 25. Q-Kt5 ch, K-K5; 26. QxB ch, K-B6;
27. R-Q3 ch (or QxR winning), K-Kt7 27. R-Q3 ch (or QxR winning), K-Kt7
(best); $28 . \mathrm{R}$-Q2 ch, K-R6 (forced); 29. (best); 28. R-Q2 ch, K-R6 (forced); 29.
QxR winning easily. If 18. ...., B-KR3 ch; 19. P-B4, K-B1;
20. R-Q8 ch, K-Kt2; 21. R-Q7, Q-KB4; 22 . R-K5, Q-B3; 23. P-KR4 and Black has run out of moves. Finally, 18. ........, KtKB3 is met by 19. Q-Kt8 ch, K-K2; 20. Q-Kt7 ch, K-K1; 21. KR-Q1, Kt-Q4; 22. RxKt, PxR; 23. RxP, B-R3 ch; 24. K-Kt1, Q-Kt3; 25. Q-B8 ch, K-K2; 26. R-Q7 ch, K-K3; 27. R-Q8 ch and wins easily.
16. ....... Kt-K2

Hopeless but nothing helps now. Pllnick proceeds with powerful hammer blows.

| 17. BxKt | KxB | 24. K-K+3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18. Q-R3ch | K-B3 | 25. QxPch |
| 19. P-B4 | Q-B6 | 26. P-K†4ch |
| 20. Kt-K5 | R×Rch | 27. R-Q4ch |
| 21. RxR | Q-K6ch | 28. $\mathrm{K} \dagger$-B4ch |
| 22. K-B2 | K-B4 | 29. QXB |
| 23. Q-K7 | Q-K5ch | 30. Q-K5 | This wins easily, of course, but 30 . QKR4!! would compel resignation immediately. The threat is Q-KKt3 mate. On 30. ......... K-Kt7; 31. R-Q2 wins the Queen, or 30 . ........ Q-KKt7; 31. Kt-Q2 ch, K-K7 (if K-K6; 32. Q-K8 ch mates in two); 32 . R-K4 ch, K-Q3 (best); 33. two); $32 . \quad \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 4,{ }^{*} \mathrm{Ch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 3$

Q-K1, QxKl; Q×Q 35. P-KR4 $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { 30. } & \text { Q } \times \text { Q } & \text { 35. P-KR4 } & \text { R-Kt1 } \\ \text { 31. } K+\times \mathrm{Ch} & \text { K-K6 } & \text { 36. P-R5 } & \text { R-KB1 }\end{array}$ 32. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4 \mathrm{ch}$ 33. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}+5$
34. $\mathrm{K}+-\mathrm{K} 5 \mathrm{ch}$ 37. P-R6
 Denker has tenaciously defended the hopeless ending but Pilnick now wraps

## things up. <br> 40. KtxRP

and resigns before White's reply. White would have played 41. KtxP followed by Kt-Q4 and the queening of the QRP. Very strongly played by Pilnick.

## Mate The Subtle Way!

by Nicholas Gabor

## Solutions, remarks, suggestions, efc., as well as compositions by any and all composers are welcome. Address all communications to Nicholas Gabor, Hotel Kemper Lane, Cincinnati 6, Ohio.

Problem No. 563
By F. Ravenscroft and F. T. Hawes Lithgow, North South Wales Australia


By Dr. Henry Wald Bettman Cincinnati, Ohio (1868-1935) First Publication

Problem No. 564
By F. Vaux Wilson Yardley, Penna.
First Publication


F the problems offered today, No. 563 is, as we see it, an "Over-Above" work from "Down-Under". The composer of No. 564 has constructed a new method of adjudicating problems based on the "numerical values of the strategies involved". You may hear more about it . . . No. 565 was discovered in the old files of the Cincinnati Chess Club amongst the many unpublished works of its composer, a very distinguished personality of the "Good Companion" period. No. 566 is the first attempt of its composer at building chess problems.

## Solutions - Mate the Subtilo Way!

No. 551 (Lacorda-Dr. Mendes): 1. Kt-Kt3, threat 2. Kt-K2 mate. The close try 1. Kt-Q6 of which a remarkably high number of solvers fell victim is defeated by 1. Kt-Q6 of wh.

No. 552 (Hassberg): Before the key, if 1. , K-Q6; 2. Kt-Kt4 mate set; if 1. ....... K-K4; 2. Kt-B4 mate set. After the key, 1. Kt-Q4, these two mates replace each other. ("The other way 'round".) Thus: 1. ......., K-Q6; 2 . Kt-B4 mate; 1. K-K4; 2. Kt-Kt4 mate. The unusual mechanism atonés for the lack of by-play. A worthy first-prize winner, with its modern strategy.

No. 554 (Mowry): Intended key: 1. Kt-Kt6, unpinning the Black Knight and allowing some triking plays. The composer apologizes for printing on his diagram the White Knight on KB8. It should have been printed on K7 square. As it was given, it allows a crude cook: 1. KtxKP which most of the solvers found.

Birmingham (Ala.) Chess Club: Twen-ty-seven players gathered, one making a 500 mile round trip by car, to face Samuel Reshevsky in a simultaneous exhibition. Result, 26 wins for the grandmaster and one draw to Ernest Cockrell, editor of the club bulletin, Magic City Woodpusher. A USCF Affiliated Club.

## Book-Ends For Sale

Bookends made from hardwood with cast Chess \& Bridge ornaments. Ask for Folder.
E \& M Mfg. Co.. P.O., Tillson. N.Y.

| Niagara Frontier Industrial Chess League: First season of this new league |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| at Buffalo saw the Bell Aircraft score |  |
| 4-0 in matches to take the title with the Knights second with 3-1. |  |
|  |  |
| FINAL STANDING |  |
| Knights |  |
|  |  |
| Linde Air Products .............................2-2 |  |
| University of Buffalo ........................1-3 |  |
|  |  |

Ghess cife

June 5, 1955

## Solution Jo

What', The But Mow?

## Solution to No. 159

Tartakover-Alekhine, New York 1924, (if Tartakover had played 29. P-B6 and lekhine QxBP, instead of the actual 29. Q-K4 which led to a draw).

White wins by 1. R-K7! P-B3 2. RxNP R-Q3 3. R-N8ch! Here 2. ....... RxP is met by 3. RxPch KxR 4. R-N6 dbl. ch. and wins. Other defenses on the first move avail not; 1. ......KxR is shattered by 2. Q-K4ch or Q-K5ch, 1. ....... R×R parts with the Queen on 2. PxQ, 1. ....... QxP encounters 2. RxR, 1. ....... Q-Q3 allows mate in 2, etc.
The happy thought of many solvers that 1. RXPCh KxR 2. Q-B4ch wins is unconvincing in view of 2 ....... Q-B3 3. R-B5 R-Q3 4. RxQ PxR. The tries, 1. Q-B2 and 1. R-N5 are both refuted by 1. .......Q-QN3. The attempt by 1. Q-K4 is more powerful and may well win in the end, but Black can play 1. Q-B4ch 2. K-R R-K2 with a stubborn resistance in prospect.
Incidentally 1. R-K7 P-B3 2, P-R6? is met by RxP and if PxPch, then KxR may be safely played.
Correct solutions (1 point) are acknowledged from Dr. J. Abramson, Prof. A. B. Anthony, K. Blumberg, Milton D. Blumenthal, Ted Bullockus, George F. Chase, J. E. Coachman, Rob ert Diekinson, Dr. H. B. Gaba, Eric L. Gans, Edwin Gault, Sydney Goodman Gans, Edwin Gault, Sydney Goodman*
Robert A. Hedgeock, Donald C. Hills, Robert A. Hedgcock, Donald C. Hills,
Heino Kurruk, Barton Lewis*, Paul Heino Kurruk, Barton Lewis*, Paul
Maker, Milton J. Martinez* Maker, Milton J. Martinez*, Peter Mu-
to, Edmund Nash, Rudd T. Neel, Hugh to, Edmund Nash, Rudd T. Neel, Hugh Schwartz, Irwin Sigmond, Paul J. Sommer, Bob Steinmeyer, W. E. Stevens, Donald W. Taylor, David A. Walsdorf jr., Hans L. Weigand, J. L. Weininger Harley D. Wilbur, William B. Wilson, B. F. Winkelman, Neil P. Witting, and L. E. Wood.

For the correet Best Move with less adequate analysis or reasons, $1 / 2$ point each is awarded to J. E. Byrd, Rea B. Hayes, Richard Hornreich, Bill Koe nig, Edmund Luksus, Howard Murray, Charles Musgrove, and T. J. Sullivan
The solvers overcame No. 159 by 39 19. Congratulations!

Welcome to new solvers.

## Solutions

Finish It the Clever Way
Position No. 153: 1. R-Q6, B-B2; 2 . RxQP, R-Q1; 3. RxR ch, BxR; 4. R-B8 and Black resigned.
Position No. 154: 1. P-Kt4!, BPxP; 2 P-K5 ch!!, PxP; 3. K-Kt6, B-R3; 4. KxP K-K3; 5. KxP, K-Q4; 6. P-R5, K-B3; 7. B-K4 ch and Black resigned.

## BOOST AMERICAN CHESSI <br> By Joining the U.S.C.F.

Subscriptions Accepted for
THE BRITISH CHESS MAGAZINE Founded in 1881 and now the oldest H. Golombek--Problem World: S.

Sedgwick
$-\$ 3.00$ per year ( 12 issues)-
Speclal thin-paper eopy 25se sent by Alrmail $\$ 4.70$ per year.
CANADIAN CHESS CHAT Official Organ of the Chess Federation of Canada Only publication with national coverage: Events, Games, Articles and personalitiesCanadian Chess Nown!
$\xrightarrow[\text { Comprehensive Australian }]{\text { CHESS WORLD }}$
Comprchensive Australian chess magadine edited by C. J. S. Purdy. Articles,
$\$ 3.00$ per year -12 lss, nes $\$ 3.00$ per year-12 issucs Sample cony 20

CHESS LIFE, 123 No. Humphrey Ave.

## Journament Life

Send to CHESS LIFE, 123 No. Humphrey Ave., Oak Park, Iil. for application form for announcing tournament in this column.

Unless otherwise specified, all tournaments announced in this column are $100 \%$ USCF rated. Rating fees, if any, are included in specified entry fee; no additional rating fee for non-members USCF.

## July 2-4

Lovisiana Open Championship Baton Rouge, La
Restricted to residents of Louisiana, Texas, Mississippi; 6 rd Swiss, 45 moves in two hrs; at Heidelberg Hotel; entry fee $\$ 2.30$; prizes: trophy and chess equipment; Newton Grant TD; for details write: A. L. McAuley, 4225 So. Liberty St., New Orleans 15, La.
$100 \%$ USCF rated event.

## July 2-4

2nd Annual Great Lakes Open Championship

## Chicago, III.

Open; 7 rd Swiss; entry deadline 12:00 noon (DST), rd 1 begins 1:00 p.m.; at Columbus Park Refectory, 5800 West Jackson Blvd., Chicago; entry fee $\$ 8.00$ donation, all monies collected minus exdonation, all monies collected minus expenses returned in prizes, $\$ 175.00$ 1st prize guaranteed; for advance registration, send cheek to Charles Brokaski, Treas., Austin Chess and Checker Club, 5600 W. Lake Street, Chicago, 111.; bring chess clocks and chess sets; time limit 45 moves in 1 hr .50 min .
$100 \%$ USCF rated event.

## July 8-10

Carolinas ${ }^{\text {t }}$ Open Championship Asheville, No. Car.
Open to all; at Battery Park Hotel; 6 rd Swiss; cash prizes and Trophy, with $\$ 50$ minimum 1st Prize; Junior Prizes; Southern hospitality and cool mountaln dew; entry fee: $\$ 3.50$ and $\$ 2$ membership in NCCA or SCCA; register 9:00 a.m., July 8th; for details, write: Wm. C. Adickes, Jr. 66 Linden Ave., Asheville, N. C.
100\% USCF Rated Event.

## July 2.5

Southern Chess Ass'n Championship, Chattanooga, Tenn.
Open; at Hotel Patten, starting at 10 a.m.; 1 rd Swiss; many trophies; Dr. H. W. Taylor TD; for details, write Major J. B. Holt, Sec'y, Long Beach via Sarasota, Fla.
$100 \%$ USCF rated event.

## September 3.5

St. Paul Open Championship St. Paul, Minn.
Open to all; combining Northwest Open with St. Paul Open; at Downtown YMCA, 9th \& Cedar; 7 rd Swiss; entry fee $\$ 7.00$. for highschool students $\$ 3.00$; Guaranteed $\$ 100$ first prize plus trophy and other prizes; TD Robert Gove; for details, write: Robert Gove, \% Downtown YMCA, 9th \& Cedar St., St. Paul, Minn.
$100 \%$ USCF rated event.

## JUST PUBLISHED! <br> THE 1000 BEST SHORT GAMES <br> OF CHESS by Irving Chernev

A treasury of masterpieces in miniature. Quick wins in 4 to 24 moves by masters and amateurs. Every game a lesson in chess tactics. Annotations lesson in chess tactics. Annotations
clarify threats, explain good and bad clarify threats, explain good and bad
moves. Self-explanatory games not annotated. A big, enjoyable, instrucannotated. A
tive volume.
570 pages, 207 diagrams.
C-30: List Price $\$ 5.00$, less $15 \%$ to members of the USCF ................ $\$ 4.25$

Mail your order to
UNITED STATES CHESS FEDERATION
81 Bedford St., New York 14, N.Y.

Containing all credited scores through solutions to Position No. 158 of "What's the Best Move" from all active solvers.)

| . Couture | 57 | J. MeDonald | 14 | J. | 5 | P. Muto |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| J. Comstock* | 541/2 | P. Sommer | 13 | L. Johnston | 5 | R. Neel |
| J. Weininger | 50 | R. Dickinson | 12 | E. Leininger | 5 | J. Pinney |
| Dr. Schwartz | 49 | R. Burry | 111/2 | E. Miller | 5 | M. Sanders |
| H. Kurruk | $481 / 2$ | H. Murray | 111/2 | C. Morgan | 5 | J. Seifert |
| W. Stevens | 43 | R. Stiening | 111/2 | S. Einhorn | 41/2 | D. Taylor |
| J. Baker | 421/2 | R. Hays | 11 | I. Frank | $44 / 2$ | E. Toblas |
| I. Sigmond | $401 / 2$ | R. Hedgcock | 10 | J. Lee | $41 / 2$ | R. Vogel |
| E. Roman | 401/2 | H. Pierson | 10 | E. Gault** | 4 | B. Winkelman |
| N . Witting | 40 | H. Weigand | 10 | R. Reithel | 4 | A. Adickes |
| J. Kauiman | $391 / 2$ | J. Carpenter | $91 / 2$ | T. Sullivan | 4 | E. Armstrong |
| F. Valvo | $381 / 2$ | L. Hyder | $91 / 2$ | L. Wood | 4 | C. Bennett |
| G. Payne | 38 | J. Coachman | 9 | W. Getz | $31 / 2$ | W. Bogle |
| D. Hamburg | 34 | Dr. H. Gaba | 9 | H. Meifert | $31 / 2$ | M. Burkett |
| D. Wals- |  | W. Newberry | 9 | A. Bolden | , | E. Gans |
| dorf Jr. | 33 | R. O'Neil | 9 | T. Bullocku | 3 | W. Harrls |
| E. Korpanty** | $311 / 2$ | F. Athey Jr. | $81 / 2$ | B. Deer | 3 | M. Hersh |
| E. Nash*** | 311/2 | J. E. Byrd | $81 / 2$ | J. Holt | 3 | M. Herzberger |
| E. Godbold | 30 | P. Work | $81 / 2$ | E. Luksus | 3 | H. Kalodner |
| N. Zemke | 30 | E. LaCroix | 促 | R. Steinmeyer | 3 | A. Larson |
| G. Chase | 291/2 | B. Sidey | 8 | D. Wilkinson | 3 | J. Learitt |
| K . Blumberg | 29 | R. Baker | 7 | F. Kerr | $21 / 2$ | C. Magerkurth |
| A. Bomberault | 26 | E. Roethler | 7 | Dr. F. Ruys | 21/2 | G. Maher |
| F. Trask | 251/2 | A. Staklis | 7 | W. Scott | 21/2 | M. Martinez |
| F. Knuppel | $241 / 2$ | G. Putnam | $61 / 2$ | M. Woodson | 21/2 | E. McDougald |
| Y. Oganesov | 241/2 | L. Ware | $61 / 2$ | M. Agranoff | 2 | Dr. K. Michaile |
| D. Silver | $241 / 2$ | R. Hayes | 6 | I. Besen | 2 | W. Miller |
| M. Blumenthal | 21 | H. Kindig | 6 | A. Brison | 2 | H. Noland |
| C. Musgrove | 201/2 | F. Klein |  | P. Calder | 2 | T. O'Dwyer |
| J. Define | 191/4 | V. Pupols | 6 | E. Congleton | 2 | J. Olsen |
| N. Reider | 19 | S. Reln | 6 | L. Harvey | 2 | J. Rosenwald |
| M, Mueller | 171/2 | E. Solkoff | 6 | R. Hornrelch | 2 | J. Soreth |
| P. Smith | $171 / 2$ | M. Klein | 51/2 | v. Hultman | 2 | G. Stallknecht |
| H. Wilbur | 161/2 | D. Ames | 5 | L. Johnson | 2 | A. Stuart |
| Dr. R. Pinson | 15 | A. Anthony | 5 | G. Labowitz | 2 | F. Tagen |
| Dr. Schlosser | 15 | F. Armstrong | 5 | A. McAuley | 2 | G. Winro |
| W. Wilson*** |  | F.Armst | 5 | A. McAuley | 2 |  |

Inactive Solvers Please Note: If you have less than 24 points and did not submit a solution to any of $153-158$, your score is not published, but your points are still good and you may resume at any time.
CONGRATULATIONS to William Couture, who wins the Quarterly Ladder Prize on his first ascent to the top.

- Each asterisk equals one previous Ladder win.

Kalamazoo Valley (Mich.) Chess Club Louis Hubert with 4-0 won the Kalamafoo Valley Championship; second to fifth on S-B with 3-1 were Harry Fall, Ojar Purins, Rueben Ballenger, and

Dr. R. A. MacNeill in the 20 player Swiss. Purins and Ballenger lost a game to Hubert; MacNeill lost to Fall; and Fall lost to Purins, A. USCF Affiliated Club.

## CHESS CLOCK



At last! A thoroughly dependable chess clock with famous Swiss mechanical movements-at a price you can afford to payl Light, compact, easy to carry around to tournaments. Overall size: $55 / 16^{\prime \prime} \times 4^{\prime \prime} \times 21 / 4^{\prime \prime}$. Dial diameter: $13 / 4^{\prime \prime}$. Tilted at slight angle for easier reading of time during play. Equippad with red flags to indicate expiration of each hour. Big red "tickers" to show which clock is running. Push-buttons on top start one clock, stop the other. Nickelled winders and timesetters permanently attached at back; no separate keys needed. Beautifully constructed by expert Swiss clockmakers. Imported for USCF exclusively by RFD Distributors. Satisfaction guaranteed or your money back! Note that price of only $\$ 17.95$ includes $10 \%$ Federal tax. No discounts.

## Mail your order to

UNITED STATES CHESS FEDERATION


[^0]:    Yale (New Haven) University Chess Club downed Columbia University team $21 / 2-11 / 2$ in a match by radio. Playing $21 / 2-11 / 2$ in a match by racko. Playing for Yale were JJames Jackson, Peter
    Field, Richard Plock, and Michael WertField,
    helm.
    Lincoln (Neb.) Chess Club: Samuel Reshevsky /scored $44-4$ in a simultaneous exhlibition, losing one game to $J$. Danenfelds, and drawing with A. Liepnieks, K. Opp, P. Wood, W. Sabin, J. Palavan, and J. Sobolevskis. A USCF

[^1]:    56th U. S. OPEN CHAMPIONSHIP
    August 8-20, 1955 Long Beach, California Eligibility: Open to all chess playPlace: Municipal Recreation Center Bldg., 350 E. Ocean Blvd., Long Beach Calif.

    Type: 12-round Swiss system; Orlo M. Rolo tournament director.

    Time of Play: Daily play: 7:00 p.m. to $12: 00 \mathrm{~m}$., except on Sat., Aug. 13 and for last two rounds. Sat., Aug. 15th reserved for U. S. Lightning Championship. 11th round starts $8: 00$ p.m. but mast starts 10:00 a.m. and must be played to finish. Adjourned games to be played on following day at to be played on following day at 50 moves in first $21 / 2$ hours, 20 moves 50 moves in first $21 / 2$
    per hour thereafter.

    ## per hour thereafter.

    Entry fees: $\$ 15.00$ for USCF members; $\$ 20.00$ for non-members ( $\$ 5.00$ for USCF dues).

    Registration: Municipal Recreation Center, 350 E. Ocean Blvd. Deadline: 1:00 p.m., August 8th. Mailed entries must be postmarked no later than August 1st. Mailed entries to be sent to Orlo M. Rolo, 3745 Lime Ave., Long Beach 7, Calif.

    Prizes: $\$ 5,050.00$ total with 1955 Ford-Mercury for 1st place, $\$ 1000.00$ for second place, and 18 other cash prizes ranging from $\$ 750.00$ for third to $\$ 50.00$ each for 15 th to 20 th place. Cash prizes for highest women's score and title of U.S. Women Open Champion for ranking woman player.
    Speed Tourney: Special U. S. Lightning Championship to be held Saturday, August 15th. Entry fee: $\$ 5.00$. Cash prizes.
    Accomodations: Hotels and meals assured at reasonable prices. Contact P. P. Looncy, President of Lincoin Beach 2, Calif., for information.

    Equipment: Players are urged to bring chess sets,
    ly chess clocks.

    Vacation Attractions: Long Beach, one of California's outstanding cities, is located on the ocean front just twenty miles south of Los Angeles. It is famed for its beautiful five harbor and its wonderful climate. Close at hand are some of America's top tourist attractions, including the fabulous new Disneyland, fabulous new Disneyland, a great Paciric Knott's Berry Farm, Cata Pacific, Knott's Berry Farm, CataIractions. Long Beach offers the ideal location for our annual championships combined with a vacation long to be remembered.

