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## XVth CHESS OLYMPIAD IN VARNA，BULGARIA

This month＇s cover shows F．I．D．E．Vice President Jerry G．Spann wishing luck to four members of the American chess team as they prepare to depart for Varna， Bulgaria，to play in the XVth Chess Olympiad．

Shaking hands with Spann is non－playing captain Eliot Hearst；the other team members shown are（l．to r．）Robert Byrne，Donald Byrne，and Edmar Mednis．Not shown are team members Bobby Fischer，Pal Benko，and Larry Evans，who met the others in Europe．The team of Fischer，Benko，Evans，the Byrne brothers and Mednis is probably the strongest ever fielded by the U．S．in an international event．

The United States is playing in Section B of the preliminaries and as we go to press has defeated Mongolia，4．0，in the opening round．Fischer，the Byrnes and Med－ nis all won their games as the competition for the Hamilton－Russell trophy got under way．The Soviet union，with World Champion Botvinnik at top board，opened by de－ feating East Germany in Section A by a 3－1 score．

United States participation in this event was made possible by a generous do－ nation（through the American Chess Foundation）from the Sadie and Arthur Lam－ port Foundation and a grant from the U．S．State Department．The U．S．C．F．，also， has been called upon to do its share，and 42 of you have already received Jerry Spann＇s letter asking you to raise $\$ 50$ or more from chessplayers in your area．We urge our other 6,000 readers to join Jerry Syann in his attempt to once again raise money to have U．S．chess properly represented on the world scene．Send your donations for the team to：USCF， 80 E．11th St．，New York 3，N．Y．In Jerry＇s words： ＂Fischer，Benko，Evans，Robert Byrne，Donald Byrne and Mednis aren＇t going to let us down，so let＇s not let them down！＂Give NOW to help the American chess team that is representing us in Varna！
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# MEDINA WINS U. S. OPEN CHAMPIONSHIP <br> TRIUMPHS OVER 144-PLAYER FIELD IN SAN ANTONIO 

Antonio Medina of Caracas, Venezuela, won the 1962 United States Open Championship played in San Antonio, Texas, August 13th through 25th.
The slender International Master played consistently fine chess to achieve his winning score of $10-2$. His victory was crystal clear, for he finished half a point ahead of grandmasters Pal Benko and William Lombardy, who tied for second and third.
After gaining three comparatively easy points in the first three rounds, Senor Medina battled nine U. S. Masters on his road to the championship. He scored a phenomenal $7-2$ against this high-caliber opposition, gaining draws with Benko and Lombardy, losing only to Robert Byrne, and defeating Arthur Bisguier, Larry Gilden, Dr. Peter Lapiken, Shelbourne Lyman, Charles Morgan, and Ken Smith.
The tenth and eleventh rounds were the crucial ones for the new champion. In his tenth round game against Dr. Lapiken, a Rook vs. Rook and Bishop endgame was reached at the expiration of the first time control. Many observers thought the game would end in a draw; however, Medina eventually triumphed after nine gruelling hours of play. Still a half-point down, he faced tournament leader Arthur Bisguier in the eleventh round. Rising to the occasion, despite his marathon of the night before, Medina mixed daring with prudence in the classic manner to upset Bisguier and go into the final round with a half-point lead over Benko and Lombardy. In that twelfth round, Benko and Lombardy drew against each other while Medina scored a full point against U. S. Junior Champion Larry Gilden.

Medina's victory was a popular one, for he conducted himself like a gentleman and a true champion throughout the entire tournament. Distinguished in both appearance and behavior, the pre-maturely-gray native of Spain was born 42 years ago in Barcelona. He won the Spanish championship five times before moving to Venezuela in 1953, and was awarded the title of International Master after finishing third in a strong field at Mar del Plata in 1948. Three national championships have been played in Venezuela since 1953, and Senor Medina has won them all. By profession, he is assistant to the production chief in a large Caracas pharmaceutical laboratory. He is also an instructor of chess and holds daily classes at the Escuela Tecnica Industrial.

Following Medina in the final standings were four International Grandmasters: Pal Benko, William Lombary, Arthur Bisguier and Robert Byrne. It is interesting to note that the five leaders played a round robin among themselves with the following results:

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Medina .........1/2 | 1/2 | 1 | 0 | (2) |
| 2 | Benko ...........1/2 | 1/2 | 0 | $1 / 2$ | (11/2) |
| 3 | Lombardy ......1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ | (2) |
| 4 | Bisguier ......... 0 | 1 | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ | (2) |
| 5 | Byrne ............. 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | ( $21 / 2$ ) |



Antonio Medina

The 144 -player field at this year's Open included ten women, of whom two -Kathryn Slater of New York City and Mabel Burlingame of Redwood City, Cal-ifornia-scored the very fine total of $61 / 2$ points. Mrs. Slater finished in 49th position and was awarded the title of U. S. Women's Open Champion.

Once again International Master George Koltanowski and a capable staff of volunteer assistants directed the event with pleasant efficiency. The burdens of arranging and supervising all the activities of the two-week period-the tournament itself, the publicity, the business meetings, and the many tours and "sideshows" that San Antonio offeredwere borne with remarkable energy and
enthusiasm by USCF National Vice President Ed Edmondson, who seemed to take a 16 -hour workday quite in his stride.
Full details of the business meetings held in San Antonio during the course of the Open will appear in future issues of CHESS LIFE.

The 1962 Open was notable for the introduction of the Chess Handicap System (for details see CHESS LIFE, May 1962). Stephen Jones, a University of Texas student from Austin, became the first United States Handicap Chess Champion. The youthful Jones, previously unknown outside the southwest, made his mark big and clear for all to see by his magnificent play in the 1962 Open. His handicap score of 2395 was a full 78 points higher than that of the second place handicap winner. His 8-4 game score was good enough for twelfth place in the Open standings, and his starting USCF rating of 2086 zoomed to 2203 -putting him in the Master class.

The complete list of Handicap winners:

| Handicap |
| :---: |
| Score |

Stephen Jones ........................................295

The Women's Handicap prize was won by U.S. Amateur Women's Champion Adele Goddard of Miami, Florida.

## U. S. OPEN CHAMPIONS

1941
1942
...Herman Steiner \& D. A. Yanofsky
1943 ......................................... A. Horowitz
1944 ...............................Samuel Reshevsky
1945 …................................. E. Santasiere

 1950 .....................................Arthur Bisguier 1951 ............................................arry Evans 1952 ........................................Larry Evans 1953 ........................................Donald Byrne 1954 .......................................Larry Evans 1955 .............................Nicholas Rossolimo 1956 ...................................Arthur Bisguier 1957 .....................................Bobby Fischer 1958 ................................E. Cobo-Arteaga 1959 1960
 ..................................................... 1961 1962
...Pal Benko .............................................................

# Games from the U. S. Open 

(Additional games and crosstable on pp. 208-209)
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SICILIAN DEFENSE
W. CUNNINGHA

|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. P.K4 | P-QB4 | 15. P-B3 | PxP |
| 2. N -KB3 | N-QB3 | 16. PXP | RxRch |
| 3. P-Q4 | PxP | 17. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$ | Q-R5 |
| 4. NXP | P-KN3 | 18. Q-Q3 | Q-N5 |
| 5. N-QB3 | B-N2 | 19. N-Q5 | K-R1 |
| 6. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | N-B3 | 20. P-B4 | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N}$ |
| 7. B-QB4 | 0.0 | 21. $B P \times B$ | B-B1 |
| 8. B-N3 | N-KN5 | 22. BXP | R-N1 |
| 9. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{N}$ | NxN | 23. BXP | R-R1 |
| 10. Q-Q1 | NxB | 24. R-R4 | RxB |
| 11. $\mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{N}$ | P-N3 | 25. Q-QB3 | Rx |
| 12. B-Q4 | P-K4 | 26. QxPch | K-N1 |
| 13. B-K3 | B-N2 | 27. PxR | B-B4C |
| 14. $0-0$ | P-B4 | 28. Resigns |  |



## SICILIAN DEFENSE

S. JONES



CENTER COUNTER GAME

| SHELBY | LYMAN | EDGAR McCO | $K$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. P-K4 | P-Q4 | 15. P.B3 | P.KB3 |
| 2. $\mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{N} \cdot \mathrm{KB3}$ | 16. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ | NXNP |
| 3. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | NxP | 17. P-R5 | P-KN4 |
| 4. P-Q4 | P-KN3 | 18. N-K4 | P -B3 |
| 5. P-B4 | N-N3 | 19. B-K2 | PXP |
| 6. $\mathrm{N} \cdot \mathrm{B} 3$ | B-N2 | 20. NXNP | Q-B1 |
| 7. B-K3 | O-O | 21. Q-B4 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 4$ |
| 8. Q-Q2 | N-B3 | 22. NxPch | K-N2 |
| 9. 0.0.0 | B-N5 | 23. $\mathrm{N} \times$ P | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{N}$ |
| 10. B-R6 | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N}$ | 24. P-R6ch | K-B2 |
| 11. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $B \times R$ | 25. P-R7 | $\mathrm{N} \cdot \mathrm{N} 3$ |
| 12. BXR | K×B | 26. P-R8(N)ch | NxN |
| 13. P-Q5 | B-N5 | 27. R-R7ch | Resigns |
| 14. | N |  |  |



After 13. ........, B-N5


## Evans-Lombardy Game Scores

Following are the remainder of the game scores of the Evans-Lombardy Match for the George P. Edgar Trophy, June 16 to Jure 29. Lombardy annotated his first round win in the July issue of CHESS LIFE, (p. 143). Evans annotated his third round win in the same issue, (p. 148). For the Tenth Game, see the Aug. issue, (p. 170).


MATCH SCORE: LOMBARDY $11 / 2$; EVANS $1 / 2$

| GAME FOUR |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOMBARDY $-1 / 2$ EVANS $-1 / 2$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | SICILIAN | DEFENSE |  |
| 1. | P-K4 | P-QB4 | 35. $\mathrm{N}(8) \cdot \mathrm{B} 6$ | K-N2 |
| 2. | N-KB3 | P.Q3 | 36. N-N6 | B-R6 |
| 3. | P-B3 | $\mathrm{N} \cdot \mathrm{KB3}$ | 37. $\mathrm{N}(\mathrm{N} 6)-\mathrm{Q} 7$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N}$ |
| 4. | B-Q3 | P-KN3 | 38. NXB | B-Q3 |
|  | B-B2 | P-K4 | 39. P-R4 | PxP |
| 6. | P-Q4 | Q-B2 | 40. N-N6 | K-B1 |
| 7. | PxKP | PxP | 41. $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{BP}$ | B-B2 |
|  | N -R3 | P.QR3 | 42. K-Q3 | K-K2 |
|  | N-B4 | N-B3 | 43. N-K3 | K-K3 |
| 10. | B-N5 | B-K2 | 44. N-B4 | B-Q1 |
|  | $\mathbf{B \times N}$ | BxB | 45. P-B3 | BxP |
|  | B-N3 | 0.0 | 46. N-N6 | K. Q3 |
| 13. | $\mathrm{N} \cdot \mathrm{K} 3$ | P-QN4 | 47. NXP | K-B3 |
|  | B-Q5 | B-Q2 | 48. P-N3 | B-B8 |
| 15. | P.KR4 | QR-Q1 | 49. K-B4 | B-K6 |
| 16. | P-R5 | N-K2 | 50. N-N2 | B-N3 |
|  | PxP | RPXP | 51. N-Q3 | B-B2 |
| 18. | Q-K2 | K-N2 | 52, P.N4 | PxP |
| 19. | 0.0-0 | R-KR1 | 53. $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{NP}+$ | K-Q3 |
| 20. | P.KN4 | $\mathbf{R \times R}$ | 54. K-N5 | P.B4 |
| 21. | R×R | NxB | 55. N-Q3 | PxP |
|  | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}$ | Q-Q3 | 56. PxP | P-N4 |
| 23. | Q-Q2 | R-KR1 | 57. N-B2 | B-N1 |
| 24. | RxR | K $\times$ R | 58. N-N4 | B-R2 |
| 25. | P-N5 | B-Q1 | 59. P-B4 | B-N8 |
| 26. | N -B6 | $\mathbf{Q x Q}+$ | 60, N-R6 | K-B2 |
| 27. | KxQ | B-K3 | 61. P-B5 | B-B7 |
| 28. | P-R3 | B-B2 | 62. P-B6 | B-Q5 |
| 29. | N-K1 | P-B5 | 63. N-N4 | K-Q3 |
| 30. | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | B-N3 | 64. N-B6 | K-B2 |
| 31. | K-K2 | P-R4 | 65. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 8+$ | K-B1 |
| 32. | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | B-QB4 | 66. N-B6 | K-B2 |
| 33. | $\mathrm{N}(3)-\mathrm{Q} 5$ | B-Q3 | 67. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 8+$ |  |
| 34. | N-K8 | B-N1 | Draw |  |

MATCH SCORE: LOMBARDY 2; EVANS 2

| Ns-1 | game five | LOMBA |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | PEZ ${ }_{\text {20, }}^{\text {R.B3 }}$ |  |
| 2. N-KB3 | N.QB3 | 21. P-N3 | $\stackrel{\text { N-N3 }}{ }$ |
| 3. B-NS | P. QR 3 | 22. B.R3 | N-Q2 |
| 4. B-R4 | N-B3 | 23. R-Q1 | N -84 |
| 5. 0.0 | B-K2 | 24. BxN | PxB |
| 6. R -K1 | P.ON4 | 25. R(3)-Q3 |  |
| 7. $\mathrm{B} \cdot \mathrm{N} 3$ | P.Q3 | 26. R-Q6 | KR.B1 |
| 8. P.B3 |  | 27. Q-K2 | ${ }^{\text {B.K1 }}$ |
| 9. P-KR3 | P-KR3 | 28. P.Q84 | 5 |
| 10. P.Q3 | N-QR4 | 29. Q-K3 | 2.B3 |
| 11. B-B2 | P.B4 | 30. R(6)-Q5 | P.QR4 |
| 12. QN-Q2 | N-R2 | 31. $\mathrm{R}(1) \cdot \mathrm{Q} 2$ | P.RS |
| 13. N - $\mathrm{Bl}^{1}$ | N-N4 | 32. B.Q1 |  |
| 14. N-K3 | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}+$ |  | K-R2 |
| 15. QxN | B-N4 |  | R.B2 |
| 16. P-KN3 | BxN | 35. K-R2 | R-R8 |
| 17. RXB | P-B5 |  | R.R4 |
| 18. Q-R5 | B.N2 | 37. P-R5 | Black |
| 19. PxP | N×P | forfeits | time |
| MATCH | E: | Lom | RdY |

(Continued on $p$. 207)

## An Answer to U.S. Champion Larry Evans

## by Weaver W. Adams

Larry Evans quotes Emanuel Lasker as saying, "The merciless fact, culminating in checkmate, contradicts the hypocrite" and that is a point not to be glossed over. I have long been regarded by many of the higher-ups in chess as a hypocrite and a charlatan; this despite the fact that I won the U.S. Open Championship in 1948 and have spent my entire life analyzing the Vienna, and,-though it has cost me many points,-publishing that analysis.

But to get on, Evans says, "Let Weaver refute these 'simple' lines before demonstrating forced wins against second-rate defenses." So I shall proceed to do just that. The first defense which Evans proposes is 1. P-K4, P-K4; 2. N-QB3, N-KB3; 3. B-B4, NxP; 4. Q-R5, N-Q3; 5. B-N3, N-B3; 6. P-Q4, NxP; 7. N-Q5, N-K3; 8. QxKP, P-QB3; 9. N-B4, Q-K2; 10. N-B3, N-KB4; 11. O-O, N/3-Q5; 12. QxQch, BxQ; 13. NxN, NxN; 14. R-K1, N-K3; 15. N-Q3, O-O; 16. P-KB4, B-B3; and now, according to Evans, Black has a won game. But let us see.


Suppose we continue now 17. P-B5, N-Q5; 18. B-KB4. Should Black play 18. NxKBP? He gets into a mite of trouble if he does by 19. P-N4, N-Q5; 20. B-Q6. So suppose we proceed normally, 18. ........ P-Q4; 19. P-N4-the crucial point. If, now, 19. ........., N-B6ch; 20. K-N2, NxReh; 21. RxN. Take a look. White is now down a pawn and the exchange, but he has a pretty good game. He threatens various things. Black's rooks and queen bishop are undeveloped. It is not right to jump to conclusions.

Evans continues: "Not once in all his avalanche of 'analysis' does Weaver consider the simple equalizing line, 6. ........, P-KN3" (i.e., 1. P-K4, P-K4; 2. N-QB3, N-KB3; 3. B-B4, NxP; 4. Q-R5, N-Q3; 5. B-N3, N-B3; 6. P-Q4, P-KN3) "7. Q-K2, and now, if Black is not in a refuting mood, I dare White to find anything resembling a slight advantage after 7 . $\qquad$ P-K5; 8. NxP, NxN; 9. QxNch, Q-K2."
So I accept the dare. If White is anxious to get his pawn back, and exchange Black's bad Knight at his Q3, this is all very well. It will probably draw. But that is the last thing White should permit. Correct is 8 . N-KB3. So suppose 8. ........., B-N2. Here Evans perhaps thought that 9. NxP is forced because 9. B-N5 is answered by 9. ........, NxP, but that is not so. 9. B-N5, NxP; 10. NxP, NxQ; 11. NxNch, PxN; 12. BxQ, KxB; 13. KxN. True, Black can win another pawn but I wouldn't say White's game is altogether hopeless. It's a question of development, something Black is very short of.


Position after 13. KxN
So I suggest that Evans should be a little more careful in his "analysis". I'm not a romantic in the sense that I look only for cheap brilliancies. There are such things to be sure, but brilliancy is also a sign of superior workmanship in all (Continued on p. 199)

# HOW WELL DO YOU PLAY? by Leonard Barden 

Working out for yourself the moves played in a master game is one of the recognized ways of improving your chess skill. Many players, however, find that they need the incentive of opposition to take a game seriously, and this article provides a stimulating answer by giving you the experience of playing alongside and against a master.

You should imagine that you are the partner of the winner, and that you have to guess the moves he makes. The notes are designed to explain fully the pros and cons of the move played and of any alternatives you are likely to choose. The best method of following the game is to use a sheet of paper or card to cover the page and to lower it as you come to each fresh move.

Keep a check of the points you score, and at the end of the game you can see how your total compares with those which various USCF ranking groups are expected to make.

You have White. Your grandmaster partner is Boris Spassky, the Soviet champion. Your opponent is grandmaster Ludek Pachman of Czechoslovakia. The game was played in the recent Havana tournament. See how well YOU can play against Pachman, one of the world's top theoreticians.

## B. SPASSKY <br> L. PACHMAN

## QUEEN'S GAMBIT DECLINED

The opening moves are 1. P-Q4, N-KB3; 2. P-QB4, P-K3; 3. N-KB3, P-Q4; 4. N-B3, B-K2; 5. B-N5, O-O; 6. P-K3, P-KR3; 7. B-R4, P-QN3; 8. PxP, NxP; 9. $\mathrm{NxN}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{N}$; 10. $B \times B, Q \times B$.


From now on, try to work out White's moves before uncovering them.

## 11. B-K2

2 points. Black has chosen the Tartakover variation, hoping to score an early draw through the exchange of several minor pieces. Your problem is to make something, if possible, of the tiny weaknesses in his position. Black's QP handicaps his bishop, and if you can tie down Black's minor pieces to the defense of the QP, e.g. by placing your B at KB3 and your N at KB4 or QB3, you may be able to force Black to give his QP further pawn defense by $\qquad$ P-QB3. If that happens,

Black will have two important pawns on white squares and his bishop will be seriously handicapped.

Another plan which you must keep in view, and which is indicated by the pawn formation, is an attack against Black's QBP-which is at present backward on an open file. To free it, he will have to advance it to QB4, and then the natural strategy is to exchange off your QP for his QBP. Then Black will have the famous 'hanging pawns' which, on the one hand, give Black plenty of space in the center, but are liable to become weak if Black's pieces are tied down to defending them.

Only 1 point for 11 . B-Q3, since the bishop may then get in the way of an attack with queen and rooks against the QP, may become liable to be hit by the advance of Black's QBP to QB5, and cannot itself be easily trained against the black QP.
2 points for the solid 11. R-B1, which keeps an eye on Black's QBP.

## 11. <br> 12. N-K5

2 points also for 12. O-O, or 12 . R-QB1. After the text, the exchange of queens by 12. ........, Q-N5ch; 13. Q-Q2, QxQch; 14. KxQ gives White a favourable ending with his king already advantageously placed.

1 point only for 12 . Q-N3 or 12 . Q-R4. The plan of placing White's queen at QR3 to attack Black's hanging pawns after ........., P-QB4 is now considered harmless and time consuming. For an illustration of how Black proceeds against this plan, refer to the game Bertok-Fischer, Stockholm 1962 (CHESS LIFE April, page 82).
12.
P.QB4
13. 0.0

1 point also for 13. PxP, 13. R-QB1, or 13. B-B3.
13.

R-Q1
(13. ........., N-Q2 is better, intending to force the retreat or exchange of White's N and retaining the option of keeping Black's KR on the KB file, or transferring it to the QB file according to circumstances).
14. R-BI

1 point for this move, for 14. PxP, or for 14. B-B3.
14.
P-B3
15. N-N6
........
2 points. White's knight is now able to reach the strong square KB4 with gain of tempo. Nothing for 15. N-Q3, (Black can establish his own Q side majority with tempo gain by 15. ......... P-B5) and nothing for 15 . N-B3 which is inconsistent with White's strategy. Deduct 2 points from your total if you chose the blunder 15. N-N4?, P-KR4; and the knight is trapped.
15.
Q-Q3
16. PxP

2 points for this or for $16 . \mathrm{N}$-B4.
16.
17. N-B4
PxP

Only 1 point for this in view of the previous clues.
17.
B-B2
18. Q.B2

ヘ.......
3 points. Black's delay in developing his queen's side with ........, N-Q2 has left his QBP more than usually weak. White's positionally correct strategy here is to attack the hanging pawns; if he fails to do so, Black's space advantage will begin to tell in his favor. The question which White should ask himself is "Which of these hanging pawns is most vulnerable to attack by my pieces?" At present, the QP is adequately guarded and the QBP is vulnerable. Hence, only 1 point now for 18. B-B3. No credit for other queen moves (the best developing move is usually the one which simultaneously attacks an enemy weakness) nor for passive, noncommittal moves like 18. P-QR3? or 18. P-QN3? Moves like this have nothing to do with White's basic plan and should be omitted or postponed until White has concentrated his forces against the weak hanging pawns to maximum effect.

## 18. <br> 19. KR-Q1 <br> $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ <br> ........

2 points. Only 1 point for 19. B-B3why? It is already clear that White's KR belongs at Q1, where it attacks Black's second hanging pawn and is also posted in a strong position vis-a-vis the black queen. The White bishop's square, on the other hand, is not yet sure; although it's probable that it will join in the attack against the hanging pawn at KB3, White wants to preserve the option of moving it to QB4 or QN5 if circumstances prove those squares stronger. If you have a choice of developing moves, hold back the piece whose options are greater.

> 19.
> 20. B-B4!

3 points. Black's last move was due to a tactical miscalculation, and now you have the chance to attack him on his weakened white squares. Nothing for 20. B-B3, QR-B1. No credit for timid moves like 20. P-QR3 or 20. P-QN3 (Black does not even threaten to capture the QRP because his bishop would be trapped by P-QN3). Deduct 3 points for the blunder 20. PxP??, QxN.
20. ........
21. QxBch

1 point.
21. ........ K.R2

22. P-QN4!

4 points for this move, which threatens to win a pawn by $23 . \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 6$ and $24 . \mathrm{NxBP}$, while Black is also left with a theoretically lost position if he replies 22. PxNP; 23. RxP followed by 24. QxP.

Only 1 point for 22 . N-K6, R-K1; when the position simplifies into a drawn rook and pawn ending by $23 . \mathrm{NxBP}, \mathrm{NxN} ; 24$. QxN (if 24. RxP, $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 3$; 25. $\mathrm{QxN}, \mathrm{QxP}$ ), QxQ; 25. RxQ, PxP; 26. PxP, RxP.

1 point for 22. Q-B2ch or 22. Q-Q3ch, which merely repeat moves after 22 . K-N1.

1 point for 22. P-KN3. This threatens to win a pawn by 23. PxP, but Black can simplify ingeniously by 22.
N-K4!; 23. QxBP, QxQ; 24. RxQ, PxP; 25. RxR, PxPch.
22. .......

QR-B1
3 points for this strong continuation, which wins at least a pawn by force. If Black now moves his attacked rook, then 24. NxBP with a technically straightforward win for White. Hence, Black decides to sacrifice the exchange to obtain some counterplay. No credit for other moves, e.g. 23. $\mathrm{PxBP}, \mathrm{RxP}=$.
23. ........
N-K4
24. Q-B2ch!

2 points. At first sight 24. PxBP (no credit) seems an equally good method of winning material, but in facto, this would lose after 24. ........, Q-K2!; 25. QN3 (or 25. Q-R6, R-B3;) R-QN1; and White's queen has no square to protect his knight. 1 point for 24. Q-N3, P-B5; 25. Q-N1ch, P-Q6; 26. NxR, QxN; and Black has more compensation for his lost material than in the actual game.
24. ........
25. NxR

P-Q6
its. Any other move loses.
25. $\qquad$ QxN
26. Q-N2
........

2 points for this or for 26. Q-B3. Only 1 point for 26. Q-R4 or 26. Q-Q2 which are more passive and less centralizing than the two stronger moves.
26. ........ P-B5

Black hopes that his two advanced and united passed pawns will prove sufficient compensation for the exchange; how do YOU prove him wrong?

## 27. P-KR3!

3 points. Always look for the clearest solution to technical problems; here White can win if he can drive Black's knight from the central post protecting the pawns. If at once 27. P-B4, (no credit) N-N5; with counterplay, so White prepares the advance and simultaneously creates 'Luft' for his king.

1 point for 27. Q-Q4, 27. P-N5, or 27. P-QR4, all of which should win without being so sharp as the text.
27. ........

Q-N3
(Black prevents P-B4)

## 28. P-QR4

2 points. 1 point for 28. P-R3, intending Q-Q4. With his actual move, White threatens to drive away Black's queen by P-R5.
28.

P-N4
(Now Black hopes for 29. P-R5, Q-B2; 30. P-B4, P-B6).
29. K-B1

3 points. 2 points for 29. P-R5, Q-B2; when White can blockade the QBP by 30. Q-B3 and again threatens P-B4. The text is even sharper; White threatens P-B4 immediately, since the reply ........, QxKP would no longer be check.

## 29. <br> K-N2 <br> 30. Q-Q4

3 points for this or for 30 . P-B4. If now 30. ........, QxP; 31. P-B4!, N-B2; 32. RxQP! QxP; 33. R(Q3)-B3 and White eliminates both the dangerous pawns and breaks through with his major pieces; award yourself 3 bonus points if you noticed this variation.
30.
P-B6
31. $R x Q P!$

4 points. No credit for 31. QxQ? PxQ; when Black's united passed pawns are suddenly very strong.


2 points. For if 32. ........, K-N3; 33. QxNch, K-N2; 34. Q-Q7ch, or 32. K-N1; 33. QxRch. Award yourself 2 bonus points if you visualized this variation before deciding your thirtieth move.

## SCORE ANALYSIS

46-53
$42-45$
37-41
33-36
27-32
20-26
10-19

USCF Senior Master strength
USCF Master strength
Expert strength
Class A strength
Class B strength
Class C strength
With more practice in your local chess club, you should reach match play standard.
Below 10 Beginner or near-beginner.

## ADAMS- (Continued from p. 197)

the arts. Dullness, which we see so much of in chess these days, is a sign of inferior workmanship. The public hasn't the least idea of what goes on in a game, and I feel that the "experts" have gotten away with their hypermodernism long enough. It is time for a change, and although it will be a long time before perfect games become so common that we will have to change the rules, that time is coming. The trouble now is that our present "masters" will have to learn the game all over again. From them I don't expect much, but the younger players are coming along. They are unprejudiced and want to be shown. The "opening of the future" will have their attention.

Since Mr. Evans has written that I and my cronies are hypocrites, Mr. Evans must prove this by a correspondence game which will be published. To make sure there is no untoward delay, I suggest that CHESS LIFE might be willing to receive and forward the moves.
(Larry Evans dropped into our office recently and read the above. His reply follows-Ed.)
I don't wish to indulge in a war of words. I did not mean to imply that Weaver personally is a hypocrite, only that there is no room for hypocrisy on the chessboard: the final proof of any claim rests in the position itself. In both of the "refutations" which Weaver here presents, Black stands much better in each of the final positions: he is ahead in material, the Queens are exchanged and White has no attack whatsoever. This the reader may judge for himself. I have no dogmatic stand to defend. I would be delighted if Weaver did come up with something good-and I would be the first to applaud.

As for his proposal to conduct a correspondence game, I will take the Black side in each of these two variations-for a purse. In common with Emanuel Lasker and Reshevsky, I share the nasty theory that a chessmaster is entitled to be paid for his efforts. In any case the outcome of any given game would reflect only our relative playing strengths and not the proposition of "White to play and win".

Larry Evans
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List Price $\$ 3.95$ Members $\$ 3.36$
HOW TO THINK AHEAD IN CHESS, Horowitz and Reinfeld
How to simplify by concentrating on one White opening, two Black Defenses; includes complete illustrative games. 212 diagrams. 268 pp .

List Price $\$ 3.50$ Members $\$ 2.98$
HOW TO WIN CHESS GAMES QUICKLY, Fred Reinfeld
How to win in 16 moves or less.
Paperbound \$1.25
HOW TO PLAY THE CHESS
OPENINGS, S. Znosko-Borovsky
The sixth, revised edition of this famous classic. 62 diagrams. 182 pp .

List Price $\$ 3.95$ Members $\$ 3.36$
ORDER FROM
U. S. CHESS FEDERATION

80 E. 11th St.
N.Y. 3, N.Y.

# Larry Evans ON CHESS 

## by U. S. Champion LARRY EVANS



## The Two Knights' Defense

This extract is translated from an article by the Soviet chessmaster Estrin which appeared in Shakhmaty Bulletin, 1962 \#4. It contains a strong antidote to the Two Knights' Defense while avoiding the Max Lange Attack. It has the further merit of not appearing in MCO.

The characteristic moves are: 1. P-K4, P-K4; 2. N-KB3, N-QB3; 3. B-B4, N-B3; 4. P-Q4, PxP; 5. P-K5, P-Q4; 6. B-QN5, $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 5$; 7. $\mathrm{NxP}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$; 8. $\mathrm{BxN}, \mathrm{PxB}$; 9. O.O (if 9. B-K3, P-QB4; 10. N-K2, P-Q5; 11. B-B4, B-B3; 12. P-KB3, N-N4; 13. O-O, B-K2; 14. N-Q2, N-K3).


Black has three principal moves: A. 9. ........, B-K2. B. 9. ........, P-QB4. C. 9. ........, B-QB4. We shall consider all these in their proper order.
A. 9 .
........, B-K2
(In passing it should be mentioned that inferior for Black is 9 . ........, Q-R5; 10. P-KB3, N-B4; 11. P-KB4, P-N3; 12. B-K3, N-K3; 13, N-Q2!, NxN; 14. BxN, P-QB4; 15. P-K6!)
9. ........, B-K2; 10. P-KB3, N-B4; 11. P-KB4, P-B4; 12. P-QN4! Sarkisky-Efremov, Polyfinals USSR Champ. 1961 continued: 12. ........, N-K3; 13. NxKBP, BxP; 14. N-N3, Q-R5 (if 14. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 4+$; 15. K-R1, O-O; 16. P-B5, N-Q5; 17. P-K6); 15. P-B3, B-R4; 16. P-B5, N-B4; 17. P-K6 with an overwhelming position.

This is an improvement over Duckstein-Keller, Zurich 1959 which continued with 14. N-R6 (instead of N-N3), Q-K2!; 15. Q-R5+, P-N3; 16. Q-Q1, B-B4+; 17. K-R1, N-N2; 18. N-B3, N-B4.

An alternative for Black is 12. ........, N-K5; 13. P-K6!, B-QB1; 14. NxQBP, Q-Q3; 15. NxB, Q-N3+; 16. K-RI, KxN; 17. Q-K1!, Q-Q5; 18. P-B3, Q-B3; 19. B-K3, QxP; 20. B-Q4 with a commanding position.

In the light of this it appears that Black must vary on move 11. The alternatives are not too satisfying either, however.
(1) 11. ........, P-B3; 12. P-B5!, O-O (if 12. ........, PxP; 13. Q-R5+, K-B1; 14. N-K6+); 13. P-K6, B-K1; 14. N-QB3, N-K5; 15. NxN, PxN; 16. B-K3, R-N1; 17. N-N3, QxQ; 18. KRxQ, P-B4; 19. NxP, RxP; 20. N-Q7, BxN; 21. RxB (Estrin-Chekhover, Leningrad 1954). Or if instead 16. $\qquad$ P-N4; 17. PxPe.p., PxP; 18. B-R6 (Haag-Leniel, Budapest 1955).
(2) 11. ......., O-0; 12. P-B5, B-N4 (if 12. ........, R-K1; 13. Q-R5, B-KB1; 14. P-QN4!, N-K5; 15. P-K6!); (or if 12. ........, N-K5; 13. N-B3); 13. N-QB3, R-K1; 14. P-QN4!
(3) 11. ........, N-K3; 12. P-B5, NxN; 13. QxN, Q-N1; (if 13. $\qquad$ O-O; 14. P-B6); 14. P-K6, PxP; 15. QxNP, R-B1; 16. B-R6 (Prahov-Kostov, 15th Bulgarian Champ.).
(4) 11. ......., N-K5; 12. P-B5, B-QB4; 13. P-K6!, PxP; 14. PxP, $\mathrm{BxP} ; 15 . \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5+, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 2$; 16. B-K3, Q-K2; 17. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{QB} 3, \mathrm{NxN} ; 18$. PxN, QR-KB1; 19. KR-K1 (Veresin-Neinshtadt, Moscow 1953).
B. 9. $\qquad$ P-QB4
9. ........, P-QB4; 10. N-N3!, B-B3 (if 10. ........, P-B5; 11. QxP and on 10. ........, B-K3; 11. P-KB3, N-N4?; 12. P-KR4); 11. P-KB3!, N-N4; 12. N-R5, B-Q2 (not 12. ........, B-N4; 13. P-QB4!); 13. QxP, N-K3; 14. N-B3 and White is a clear Pawn ahead.
9. ........, P-QB4; 10. N-N3, B-N4; 11. R-K1, B-K2; 12. P-KB3, N-N4; 13. N-B3, P-QB3; 14. P-KB4, N-K3; 15. P-B5 with strong attack.
9. $\qquad$ P-QB4; 10. N-N3, P-QB3; 11. P-QB41, PxP; 12. $\mathrm{N}(3)-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{NxN}$; 13. $\mathbf{N x N}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 2$; 14. $\mathbf{N x P}$ with advantage, VeresinRyuchov, Moscow 1953.

Estrin-Sadomsky continued with 13. ........, B-K3 (instead of B-K2); 14. Q-R4, Q-N3 (on 14. ........, Q-Q4; 15. NxP anyway); 15. Q-B2! (not 15. NxP, Q-N4!), Q-R3; 16. N-K4, O-O-O; 17. B-K3, Q-N4; 18. N-N5, R-Q4; 19. NxBP, BxN; 20. Q-B5+ with advantage.
C. 9 .

B-QB4
This is the most active of Black's defenses.
9. ........, B-QB4; 10. B-K3, Q-K2!; 11. P-KB3, N-Q3!; 12. B-B2, N-B4; 13. N-B3, O-O; 14. N-R4, B-N3; 15. R-K1, $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}$; 16. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4 ; 17 . \mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{N} ; 18$. B-B2, P-Q5 with a satisfactory game for Black (Ragosin-Proty, Polyfinals 19th USSR Champ.).

White's best antidote is 9. ........, B-QB4; 10. B-K3, Q-K2; 11. R-K1!, O-O; 12. P-KB3, N-N4; 13. Q-Q2, P-B3 (if 13. N-K3; 14. N-B3, B-N3; 15. K-R1, P-KB4; 16. P-KB4 followed by N-N3 with a bind); 14. K-R1, KR-K1; 15. BxN, PxB; 16. N-B3, R-KB1; 17. N-R4, BxN; 18. QxB, R-B5; 19. Q-B5, Q-K3. Bagirov-Amirhanov, Baku 1939 continued: 20. Q-R5, R-R5; 21. N-B5, Q-R3; 22. NxB, RxP+; 23. K-N1, Q-R5 winning. Better for White is 20. P-QN3 (instead of Q-R5).

After 9. ........, B-QB4; Estrin recommends the immediate 10. P-KB3, N-N4; 11. B-K3.

If now 11. $\qquad$ O-O; 12. N-Q2 (better than 12. Q-Q2, P-B3!; 13. PxP, QxP; 14. N-B3, N-B2; 15. N-N3, B-Q3; 16. B-B5, N-K4 with advantage for Black (Bagirov-Sherbakov, Leningrad 1956), P-B3; 13. N(2)-N3, B-N3; 14. Q-Q2, N-R6+!; 15. PxN, PxP; 16. $P \cdot Q B 3, P \times N ; 17 . P \times P, B \times R P-g o o d$ for Black.

Therefore White must improve after 11. ........, 0-0; with 12. P-KB4, N-K5; 13. N-Q2, P-B4; 14. $\mathrm{NxN}, \mathrm{BP} x \mathrm{~N}$; 15. Q-Q2, B-N3; 16. N-N3, P-QR4; 17. P-QR4, Q-K2; 18. K-R1, R-B2; 19. Q-B3, P-N3; 20. B-B5, Q-K1; 21. P-R3 with a bind (EstrinDommes, USSR 1958).

Naturally these variations are not exhaustive. But Estrin seems to feel that Black's best play is not 11. ........, O-O, but 11. ........, B-N3! instead. He cites the following continuation as best play: 12. P-KB4, N-K5; 13. N-Q2, P-QB4; 14. N-K2, NxN; 15. QxN, P.Q5; 16. B-B2, O.O; 17. P.QR4, P-QR3 with even chances (Borobech-Bannik, Kiev 1956).

## Conclusion:

This is an extremely trappy variation where White can build up an overwhelming attack with hardly more than mechanical moves. It is certainly a good way of surprising a Black player who habitually espouses the Two Knights' Defense. Black's most active defense is with 9 . ........., B-QB4, although improvements will no doubt be found before that. At any rate the most that Black can hope for is equality if he wends his way through the maze of complications.

# LESSONS 

## IN THE

# ENDGAME 

## by DR. ERICH W. MARCHAND, U. S. Master

## ENDGAME LESSON VI

## 1. More About Rook and Pawn Endings

One might wonder why endgames are so difficult. After all there are fewer pieces to consider. The answer seems to lie in the fact that in endgames there is much more free space available so that the remaining pieces have many more places they can go. This is especially true of Rooks and Queens with their great mobility.

In almost all endings one must use different ideas and principles from those which apply in the middle-game. This results from the increased mobility of the pieces, the increased importance of passed Pawns, and the growing activity of the Kings in view of less likelihood of checkmate on an open board. Also peculiar stalemate possibilities as well as perpetual check possibilities give endgame play some special features.

## 2. Rook versus One or More Pawns

A Rook is usually valued at about four and one-half Pawns, but this is only a rough rule of thumb. In particular situations the value can be quite different. Certain endgames illustrate this point clearly. For instance, consider the following position:


Here White draws even though he has only a Pawn against Black's Rook. The play might go (assuming Black to move):

| 1. | \#..... | K-N2 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 2. | P-R6 | K-B2 |
| 3. | P-R7 | K-K2 |
| 4. | K-N7 | K-Q2 |
| 5. | P-R8(Q) | R-N8ch |
| 6. | K-R6 | ........ |

Or 6. K-R7, K-B2!?; 7. Q-R8 (the only move to stop Black's winning by R-R8ch) and in this position White should win.
6.
R-R8ch
7. K-N7
R×Q

In some peculiar cases the single Pawn can be even better than a Rook. This is seen in the following famous problemlike position despite the fact that White has only a Pawn for a Rook and also is in check.


The winning procedure begins 1. K-N5

On 1. K-B5, R-Q8; 2. P-B8(Q), R-B8ch Black would win, or 1. K-N7, R-Q2; 2. K-N8, RxP draws.

1. ........ R-Q4ch

Otherwise P-B8 will win.

## 2. K-N4

Or 2. K-B6, R-Q8; 3. P-B8(Q), R-B1ch drawing; or 2. K-B4, R-Q8; or 2. K-N6, R-Q3 ch repeating the original position.
2.
…....
R-Q5ch
3. K-N3

The analysis here is similar to the last note.
3.
R-Q6ch
4. K-B2
........

Now Black cannot play R-Q8, but he has a clever resource.
4.

## R-Q5

If now 5. P-B8(Q), R-B5ch; 6. $Q x R$ we have a stalemate! However, if White foresees this he plays.
5. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 8(\mathrm{R})$ !

Now, strange enough, Black loses even though the material is even. White threatens R-R8ch followed by mate. So
5.

R-QR5
6. K-N3!

Threatening both KxR and R-B1 Mate. So White wins.

To be sure this ending is highly unusual. However, it illustrates some of the surprising complexities which can arise in a relatively simple endgame position. The beginner should note especially (1) the power of an advanced passed Pawn (2) the possibility of a surprising stalemate, (3) the possibility of underpromotion (taking some piece other than a Queen when "Queening" a Pawn), and (4) the importance of an active King position in an ending.

## 3. Rook versus two Pawns

Ordinarily, of course, a Rook wins easily against a single Pawn. The same is usually true for a Rook versus two Pawns. Consider for instance the following case:


Even if it is White's move, Black wins easily:


Suppose, however, White's passed Pawns are connected:


Now White wins even if Black is on the move. For instance

Or 1

| 1. | ....... | R-R1 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2. | P-R3; | 2. P-N7, R-QN6; | 3. P-R7. |
| 3. | P-R7 | R-QN1 |  |

This ending idea is fairly common in practice and very important to know. Two connected passed Pawns on the sixth rank win against a lone Rook. Sometimes one may sacrifice material to create this situation.

Another point to note is the difference between this position and the preceding one. Connected Pawns are generally much stronger than isolated ones. This should be kept in mind throughout the opening and middlegame.

We consider next a case where White has two connected Pawns but they are only on the fifth rank.


Here, if it is Black's move he wins easily by
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { 1. } & \text {........ } \\ \text { 2. } & \text { P-N6 } \\ \text { 3. } & \text { P-N7 }\end{array}$
R-R4
RxP
R-QN4

However, suppose it is White's move in the diagrammed position. Then White can at least draw. One line is

## 1. P-N6 R-QN2

Otherwise P-R6 wins for White, or 1. ........, R-R3; 2. P-N7.
2. K-B2

No better is 2. K-K2.

| 2. | $\ldots . . .$. | K-N5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3. | K-K3 | K-B4 |
| 4. | K-Q4 | K-K3 |
| 5. | K-B5 | K-Q2 |
| 6. | P-R6 | K-B1 |

There is nothing better. For 6. ........, R-N1; 7. P-R7, R-N1 (or R-QR1); 8. P-N7 wins for White. Or 6. $\qquad$ RxP?; 7. $\mathrm{KxR}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 1$; 8. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R7}$ winning.

## 7. PxRch

Or 7. P-R7, RxRP.
7. $\begin{aligned} & \text { K-N.... } 5\end{aligned}$
$K \times P$
K-N1

Drawing as described in our earlier lesson on King and Pawn endings.

Returning to the diagrammed position we note that White has an alternative line. And it proves to be stronger than the one above.

| 1. | P-R6! | R-R2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2. | K-B2 | K-N5 |
| 3. | K-K3 | K-B4 |
| 4. | K-Q4 | K-K3 |
| 5. | K-B5 | K-Q2 |
| 6. | K-N6 | R-R1 |

Or 6. ........, R-B2; 7. P-R7, R-QB1; 8. K-N7, R-B2ch; 9. K-R6, R-B1; 10. P-N6 wins.
7. K-N7
R.QB1

## 8. P-R7

And White wins as in the last note.
This ending shows how far ahead one must calculate in some endings. The effect of choosing 1. P-R6 or 1. P-N6 is not felt until about eight moves later.

For the sake of theory one should observe that the last ending is not entirely typical. Two connected passed Pawns on the fifth rank usually do not win or even draw. Whereas on the sixth rank they usually do (though not always). The exact placement of the Rook and the two Kings makes considerable difference.

## 4. Rook versus Three Pawns

Of the many possible examples under this heading we consider only one which is similar to the preceding with an extra connected Pawn.


Here, even wtih Black to move, White wins. For instance

| 1. | P...... | R-R4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2. | P-N6 | RxP |
| 3. | P-R6 | ........ |

And the connected Pawns on the sixth rank win.

A second try is 1 . R-QN2; 2. PN6, R-N1; 3. P-R6, R-QR1; 4. P-R7, etc. No better or worse is 1 . $\qquad$ R-QB2; 2. P-N6, RxP; 3. P-R6.

## 5. An Interesting Ending from Actual Play

The following ending was of the Rook-and-Pawn type for only one move. It then became a King-and-Pawn ending and later a problem-like Queen versus King and two Pawns ending. The position arose in Marchand-Hoffman, U.S. 30-30 Championship, Poughkeepsie, 1962. Occasional lapses by the players can be pardoned in view of the fast time limit.


The game continued.


Black has the better of it since his King is farther forward.

| 33. K-K2 | K-Q5 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 34. K-Q2 | P-Q4 |
| 35. PxP | KxP |
| 36. K-B3 | K-K4 |
| 37. K-B4 | P-KR4 |

37. ........, P-KB5; 38. PxPch, KxP; 39. P-Q4, PxP; 40. KxP, K-N5; 51. K-Q5 leads to a draw, as does the text-move with proper play.
38. P-QR4
39. PxPch
P.B5
40. P-Q4
41. KxP
KxP
PxP
K-N5

Not essentially different from 41. ........, K-B6; 42. K-Q5, K-N7; 43. P-R4, K-N6 since each side loses one tempo. The ultimate position of Black's King is not significant except for one important square (see below).

| 42. K-Q5 | K-R6 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 43. K-B6 | KxP |
| 44. K-N7 | K-N6? |



An unfortunate mistake due to the fast time rate. The point is that White will Queen on N8 (not R8) and so will queen with check and thereby win instead of merely drawing.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 45. KxP } & \text { P-R5 } \\
\text { 46. P-R5 } & \text {-...... }
\end{array}
$$

Here 46. KxP etc. is too slow.
46. ........ PxP

Or 46. ........, P-R6; 47. PxP, P-R7; 48. P-N7, P-R8(Q); 49. P-N8(Q)ch and White should win eventually.

| 47. P-N6 | P-R6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 48. P-N7 | P-R7 |
| 49. P-N8(Q)ch | K-N7 |

This is like a position discussed in one of our earlier lessons. It would be drawn if Black did not have his second Pawn. Here the crucial stalemate possibility is not available to Black since he can move his other Pawn.

| 50. Q-N8ch | K-B7 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 51. Q-R7 | K-N7 |
| 52. Q-N6ch | K-B7 |
| 53. Q-R5 | K-N7 |

Here Black could have made the win much more difficult by 53. ........, K-N6! (since 54. QxP, K-N7 draws); 54. Q-N5ch, K-R6! (not 54. ........, K-B7; 55. Q-B4ch as in the game); 55. Q-K3ch, K-N7 (not 55. ........, K-R5; 56. Q-B2ch, K-R6; 57. Q-B3ch, K-R5; 58. Q-KN2); 56. Q-K4ch, K-N6 (not 56. ........, K-N8; 57. Q-N4ch); 57. K-N6!, P-R5; 58. K-B5, P-R6; 59. KQ4, P-R7; 60. Q-R1, P-R8(Q); 61. QxQ, K-N7; 62. K-K3! (now that the White King is near, the usual draw rule does not apply), P-R8(Q); 63. Q-N7ch, K-B8; 64. Q-B6ch, K-N7; 65. Q-N5ch, K-R6; 66. Q-R5ch, K-N2; 67. Q-N4ch, K-B8 (if 67. ........, K-R7, then 68. K-B2!!); 68. QK2ch, K-N1; 69. Q-B2 Mate.

| 54. Q-N4ch | K-B7 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 55. Q-R3 | K-N8 |
| 56. Q-N3ch | K-R8 |
| 57. Q-B2 | Resigns |
| of 57. | ........ |

# GAMES FROM RECENT EVENTS 

Presented by

LEONARD BARDEN

Veteran grandmaster Miguel Najdorf nosed out three Soviet grandmasters in Havana to score the greatest success of his career. Here's an example of how he did it, and of the big effort made by Soviet champion Boris Spassky to catch him.

## Najdorf <br> (Argentina)-1 <br> Matanovic <br> (Yugoslavia)- 0

## KING'S INDIAN

Petrosian's attack against the King's Indian with the development of White's QB at KN5 aims to restrict Black's K side operations while White invades the queen's side by using his pawns as battering rams. Compare the strategy in this game with Evans' New Ideas in Chess, page 126. Black's piece sacrifice on move 29 is unsound, but he has no defense to the threat of $30 . \mathrm{BxPch}, \mathrm{QxB} ; 31$. R -R8ch.

| 1. | P-Q4 | N-KB3 | 18. NxN | NPxN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. | P-QB4 | P-B4 | 19. R-QNI | B-R5 |
| 3. | P-Q5 | P.Q3 | 20. O-O | BxBch |
| 4. | N-QB3 | P-KN3 | 21. RxB | PxP |
| 5. | P-K4 | B-N2 | 22. $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | B-B4 |
| 6. | N-B3 | 0.0 | 23. B-Q3 | QR-N1 |
| 7. | B-K2 | P-K4 | 24. Q-B1! | RxR |
| 8. | B-N5 | P-KR3 | 25. QxR | K-R2 |
| 9. | B-R4 | Q-B2 | 26. R-N2! | R-B2 |
| 10. | N-Q2 | N-K1 | 27. P-N4 | BxN |
| 11. | P-B3 | P-B4 | 28. BxB | Q-B3 |
| 12. | P-QR3 | B-B3 | 29. R-N8 | N-B4 |
| 13. | B-B2 | Q-K2 | 30. PxN | PxP |
| 14. | Q-B2 | N-N2 | 31. B-Q3 | P-K5 |
| 15. | P-QN4 | N-Q2 | 32. PxP | R-K2 |
| 16. | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | P-N3 | 33. K-R1 | Q-B6 |
| 17. | NPxP | NxP | 34. P-K5! | Resigns |

Pietzsch (East Germany)-0 (Soviet Union)-1

## RUY LOPEZ

An early ........, P-QN4; in the Lopez is condemned by theory because of the pawn sacrifice made here by White. Spassky's idea of 11. ........, Q-Q2!; and long castling is a big improvement on the previous 11. ........, O-O?; 12. B-R6, N-K1; 13. B-Q5, Q-Q2; 14. Q-N4! (GligoricRossetto, Portoroz 1958). If Spassky's new idea holds, White will have to think again on move 9 , and play the more conservative 9. B-K3.

In the middle game, Black's active pieces easily compensate for the pawn positionally sacrificed. An interesting variation is 21. P-B3?, N-K7ch; 22. K-R2, P-QB3!; 23. NxP, RxKP!; 24. B-R6, R-B3; 25. P-N5, B-N6ch and mates.

In the time rush, Spassky blunders. 38. ........, RxR!; 39. NxPch, BxN; 40. P$\mathrm{N} 8(\mathrm{Q})$, is a likely draw. In the game, 39. N-N3!, wins for White.

| 1. | P-K4 | P.K4 | 26. R-B8 | K-B3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. | N-KB3 | N-QB3 | 27. N-K3 | B-K2 |
| 3. | B-N5 | P-QR3 | 28. R-B7 | P-Q4 |
| 4. | B-R4 | N-B3 | 29. N-B5 | B-B4 |
| 5. | 0.0 | P-Q3 | 30. RxP | P-Q5 |
| 6. | P-B3 | B-N5 | 31. B-Q2 | N-N8th |
| 7. | P-Q4 | P-QN4 | 32. K-N3 | R-K7 |
| 8. | B-N3 | B-K2 | 33. P-N5! | RxB |
| 9. | P-KR3 | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N}$ | 34. P-N6 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 7 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| 10. | QxB | PxP | 35. K-N4 | N-B6? |
| 11. | Q-N3 | Q.Q2! | 36. P-N7 | RxPch |
| 12. | QxNP | 0.0.0 | 37. K-B3 | R-N4 |
| 13. | QxBP | K-N2 | 38. R-R5! | R-N8? |
| 14. | B-K6 | Q-K1 | (see dia | gram) |
| 15. | PxP | NxQP | 39. PxN?? | QPxP |
| 16. | N-B3 | R-KB1 | 40. R-R1 | P-B7! |
| 17. | QxQ | QRxQ | 41. RxR | BxR |
| 18. | B-N4 | NxB | 42. P-N8(C) |  |
| 19. | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{N}$ | P-N5 |  | P-B8(Q) |
| 20. | N-Q5 | B-R5! | 43. K-N4 | Q-Q8ch |
| 21. | B-R6! | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 7 \mathrm{ch}$ | 44. K-N5 | Q-Q7ch |
| 22. | K-R2 | RxBP | 45. K-B6 | Q-N7ch |
| 23. | K-R3 | RxR | 46. K-K7 | Q-K4ch |
| 24. | R×R | B-Q1 | 47. K-Q8 | QxN |
| 25. | R-B7 | RxP | 48. QxB | Q.Q2 |

## Russians Win "Students"

With no American team in the World Students' tournament, the Russian big guns, headed by Soviet champion Spassky, were easy winners of the 18 country event held at Marianske Lazne, Czechoslovakia.

Top scorers were Soviet Union with $241 / 2$ out of 32, Yugoslavia 20, Czechoslovakia 19, East Germany 17.

Spassky, who many experts consider just as good as the Russians in the Candidates' tournament, took the prize for the best top board score without losing a game. Here's how he did it.

## Spassky <br> (Soviet Union)-1 <br> (Yugoslavia) Ciric <br> SICILIAN DEFENSE

The 2. ........, N-KB3; line in the Sicilian has been given new life by Larsen's pawn sacrifice 6. ........, N-B3!?. Probably fearing a prepared variation, Black deviates from the critical line 12. ........, N -Q5ch; 13. K-Q1, N-K3; 14. P-B3, P-Q3; 15. PQN4, BxP; and tries a shock piece sacrifice. Spassky finds the refutation: instead, 14. BxP?, B-N5ch; 15. K-Q2, QR-Q1; 16. NxBP, RxBch! probably gives Black a winning attack. Spassky smashes the attack by 'sacrificing' his queen for a rook and two bishops.


KING'S INDIAN
An important game for opening theory, and another bull sign for the Samisch. Spassky's 8. N-B1! gains a vital tempo on 8. Q.Q2 and a later N-B1, as played for instance in Petrosian-Fischer and Filip-Benko at Curacao (see CHESS LIFE, June 1962, page 125, and July 1962, page 147). Black plays a pawn sacrifice which is good after 8. Q-Q2, B-Q2; 9. N-B1, but gives him no counterplay here. Spassky winds up with merciless technique.

| . | P-Q4 | N-KB3 | 16. B-Q3 | N-Q2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. | P-QB4 | P-KN3 | 17. 0.0 | N-K4 |
| 3. | N-QB3 | B-N2 | 18. P-QN3 | N-B3 |
| 4. | P-K4 | P.Q3 | 19. Q-Q2 | Q-R5 |
| 5. | P-B3 | 0.0 | 20. QR-K1 | QR-K1 |
| 6. | B-K3 | N-B3 | 21. N-Q5 | B-Q5 |
| 7. | KN-K2 | P-QR3 | 22. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ | NxB |
| 8. | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | P-K4 | 23. P-B4 | BxN |
| 9. | P-Q5 | N-Q5 | 24. BPxB | R-K2 |
| 10. | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | P.B4 | 25. BxP | KR-K1 |
| 11. | PxPe.p. | . PxP | 26. B-Q3 | P-B4 |
| 12. | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{N}$ | 27. P.K5! | PxP |
| 13. | BxP | P-B4 | 28. P-Q6 | R-K3 |
| 14. | B-K3 | R-N1 | 29. B-B4 | P-K5 |
| 15. | Q-B2 | B-K3 | 30. P-QN4! |  |

Resigns

## Spassky

Zinn

## (Soviet Union)-1 (East Germany)-0

 CATALAN OPENINGIn Catalan-type positions, you can often gambit White's QBP for long-term positional attack and a bind on Black's queen wing. Spassky's squeeze technique is similar to that in Botvinnik-Bisguier, Hastings 1961/2 (CHESS LIFE, March, page 49).

| 1. | P-Q4 | P-Q4 |  | B-R3 | Q-K2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. | P-QB4 | P-QB3 |  | R-Q6! | B-R3 |
| 3. | N-KB3 | P-K3 |  | QR-Q1 | R-N2 |
| 4. | P-KN3 | $\mathbf{P \times P}$ |  | see diag |  |
| 5. | B-N2 | P.QN4? |  | NxKBP! | $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{N}$ |
| 6. | 0.0 | B-N2 | 25. | BxPch | QxB |
| 7. | P-N3! | PxP | 26. | $\mathbf{R x Q}$ | K $\times$ R |
| 8. | QxP | N-B3 | 27. | Q-N3ch | K-K2 |
| 9. | N-B3 | B-K2 | 28. | Q-N8 | P-R3 |
| 10. | N-K5 | P-QR3 | 29. | R-Q6! | NxR |
| 11. | B-K3 | O-O | 30. | PxNch | K-Q2 |
| 12. | N-K4 | N-Q4 | 31. | QxPch | KxP |
| 13. | KR-B1 | P.QR4 | 32. | QxPch | K-Q2 |
| 14. | B-Q2 | Q-N3 | 33. | Q-N7ch | K-Q3 |
| 15. | Q-N2 | R-B1 | 34. | Q-B6ch | K-B2 |
| 16. | N-B5 | R-R2 | 35. | Q-K5ch | K-Q2 |
| 17. | P-K4 | N-B3 | 36. | Q-B5ch | K-B2 |
| 18. | B-K3 | BxN | 37. | B-B4ch | K-N3 |
| 19. | $\mathbf{P \times B}$ | Q-B2 | 38. | QxR | K-R2 |
| 20. | R-Q1! | N-K1 | 39. | P-K5 R | esign |



After 23. ........, R-N2

## Gufeld <br> (Soviet Union)-0 (Czechoslovakia)-1

## RUY LOPEZ

A game with an ending probably unique in chess history; a bishop and five pawns defeat two rooks! In the opening, White ought to play 5. PxBP!, and later 7. NxKP!. Black's 7. ........., P-K6! is Czech analysis which favors Black.

| 1. P-K4 | P-K4 | 19. B-R3 | KR-KN1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | N-QB3 | 20. N-Q2 | BxKNP |
| 3. B-N5 | B-B4 | 21. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathbf{R \times B}$ |
| 4. P-B3 | P.B4 | 22. R-KB1 | R-Q1 |
| 5. P-Q4? | BPXP | 23. K-K2 | R×Nch! |
| 6. N-N5 | B-N3! | 24. KxR | P.K5 |
| 7. P-Q5? | P.K61 | 25. B-B8 | P-B5 |
| 8. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | Q-R5 | 26. P-N4 | R-N4 |
| 9. Q-B3 | N-B3 | 27. B-B5 | RxB!! |
| 10. NxNch | PxN | 28. PxR | BxP |
| 11. PxN | PxPch | (see di | gram) |
| 12. K-Q1 | QPxP | 29. QR-N1 | K-B4 |
| 13. B-K2 | B-K3 | 30. R-N4 | P-B6! |
| 14. Q-R5ch | QxQ | 31. R-Q4 | BxR |
| 15. BxQch | K-K2 | 32. PxB | K-B5 |
| 16. P-QN3 | B-Q4 | 33. RxP | P-K6ch |
| 17. B-R3ch | K-K3 | 34. K-K1 | PxRch |
| 18. B-N4ch | P-B4 | 35. KxP |  |

White over-stepped the time limit.


After 28. ........, BxP

## Russians Beat Yugoslavia

The traditional Soviet Union-Yugoslavia match, held in Lvov, was won, as usual, by the Russians 37-23, although they were playing only their second line grandmasters (Bronstein, Vasiukov, Stein, Taimanov etc.). Here's a game from the match including probably the biggest series of grandmaster blunders in any game of 1962.

## Ivkov <br> Vasiukov <br> (Yugoslavia)-0 (Soviet Union)-1 SICILIAN

Vasiukov introduces a new idea against the 6. B-QB4 attack, by playing ........, N-QR4 earlier than anyone has yet done so. He cracks badly in the middle game (13. ........., B-N2!) and White gets a winning attack with 15. P-B6! (15. ........., NxR; 16. PxB, R-K1; 17. B-B6).

With a textbook mating attack, Ivkov astonishingly overlooks 18. B-R4!, P-N3; 19. Q-N5, K-R1; 20. Q-R6, R-KN1; 21. B-N5 and 22. QxP ch!

He could still win later by 20. Q-R4 and 21. P-KN4, and even right at the end by 24. Q-R4. Instead, White constructs a self-mate.

| 1. | P-K4 | P-QB4 | 15. P-B6! | B-Q1 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 2. | N-KB3 | N-QB3 | 16. PxN | Q-B2 |
| 3. | P-Q4 | PxP | 17. R-Q3 | B-N2 |
| 4. | NxP | N-KB3 | (see diagram) |  |
| 5. | N-QB3 | P-Q3 | 18. R-N3? | P-N33 |
| 6. | B-QB4 | P-K3 | 19. R-R3 | P-KR4 |
| 7. | B-N3 | N-QR4 | 20. RxP? | QxP |
| 8. | P-B4 | NxB | 21. R-R8ch | KxR |
| 9. RPXN | P-QN3 | 22. P-K5! | R-B1 |  |
| 10. P-B5 | Q-Q2 | 23. K-N1 | K-N1 |  |
| 11. | B-N5 | B-K2 | 24. R-QB1? R-B4! |  |
| 12. Q-K2 | O-O | 25. B-Q2 | QxB |  |
| 13. | O-O-O | N-Q4? | 26. Resigns |  |
| 14. Q-N4! | NxN |  |  |  |



After 17. ........, B-N2

## BRANDTS TAKES <br> MANHATTAN

Paul Brandts won the 1962 Manhattan Club Championship this year with an undefeated score of $101 / 2 \cdot 11 / 2$. Arthur Feuerstein was second with $9-3$ and Eugene Shapiro was third with $81 / 2-31 / 2$. All three players had a 2400 master performance record in this tournament. In Section No. 2, for Candidates, Asa Hoffman was first with 8-2; Mrs. G. Gresser, the U.S. Women's Champion, was second with $71 / 2-21 / 2$; John Dunkle, third with $6 \frac{1}{2}-31 / 2$.

Below, is the sixth round game of Kramer-Brandts. This game was, in Brandts' opinion, his best effort in the event. The preface is his.
"In this game White gambits a pawn in the opening, but succeeds in obtaining virtually no tactical initiative as a result. Black remains a pawn ahead, but is faced with technical difficulties, particularly as there are bishops of opposite colors. In the last stages of the game, as Black attempts to exploit his advantage, there is a series of combinative thrusts and counter-thrusts that-in my opinion at least-give the game distinction. You will note that in the final position White is in a mating net in which he is compelled to lose material."

## GEORGE KRAMER LOPEZ

| $\begin{gathered} \text { GEORGE } \\ (2239) \end{gathered}$ | AMER | PAUL BRANDTS (2353) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. P-K4 | P-K4 |  | B-K4 | R-B4 |
| 2. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | N-QB3 |  | BxN | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| 3. B-N5 | P-QR3 |  | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q}_{3}$ | Q-B2 |
| 4. B-R4 | N-B3 |  | R(1)-B2 | P-N3 |
| 5. O-O | B-K2 |  | P-KN3 | R-B1 |
| 6. R-KI | P-QN4 |  | P-B4 | B-N2 |
| 7. B-N3 | P-Q3 |  | Q-K1 | O-B3 |
| 8. P-KR3 | O-O |  | K-R2 | K-B1 |
| 9. P-B3 | N-QR4 |  | P-KR4 | Q-Q4 |
| 10. B-B2 | P-B4 |  | B-K4 | Q-N6 |
| 11. P-Q4 | Q-B2 |  | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ | PXR |
| 12. QN-Q2 | BPxP | 35. | B-N7 | R-Q1 |
| 13. PXP | N-B3 | 36. | Q-R5 | B-B3 |
| 14. N - $\mathrm{B}_{1}$ | PXP | 37. | Q-N6 | K-N2 |
| 15. B-B4 | B-K3 |  | P-KN4 | Q-Q6 |
| 16. P-QR3 | N-Q2 | 39. | R-K4 | BXP |
| 17. R-B1 | Q-N3 |  | P-B6ch | K-R3 |
| 18. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | N(2)-K4 | 41. | P-N5ch |  |
| 19. N -B5 | $\mathbf{B \times N}$ |  |  |  |
| 20. PXB | B.B3 | (Th | e sealed | ed move, |
| 21. B-K4 | QR-B1 | but | White r | resigned |
| 22. R-K2 | NxNch | wit | hout res | resuming |
| 23. BxN | N-K4 | pla | y.) |  |


| STUDENT CHODES | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TEAM C } \\ & \text { (USSR) } \end{aligned}$ | CHAMP. MOHRIN | (East | BAD 1962 Germany) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. P-Q4 | N-KB3 | 311. | QXNP | Q-N3 |
| 2. P-QB4 | P-Q3 |  | QXR | B-Q3 |
| 3. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | P-K4 |  | P×P | QxQP |
| 4. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | P.K5 |  | P.K4 | $\mathbf{N X K P}$ |
| 5. N-KN5 | B-B4 |  | NxN | $\mathbf{B \times N}$ |
| 6. P-B3 | PxP |  | P×B | QxP+ |
| 7. NPXP | P-Q4 |  | B.K3 | Q×B+ |
| 8. PxP | P-KR3 |  | B-K2 | R-R5 |
| 9. Q-R4+ | P-B3 |  | P-B7 | B-N5- |
| 10. Q-N3 | PxN |  | Resig |  |


|  | HUNGARIAN | CHAMP. 19 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DELY L. SZABO |  |  |  |
| 1. P-K4 | P-QB4 | 10. P-K5 | PxN |
| 2. N-KB3 | 3 P -Q3 | 11. P×N | N-Q2 |
| 3. P-Q4 | PxP | 12. P-B5 | P-K4 |
| 4. NXP | N-KB3 | 13. $\mathrm{BxP}-$ | $\mathbf{K \times B}$ |
| 5. N-QB3 | 3 P-QR3 | 14. Q-R5+ | P-N3 |
| 6. B-QB4 | P-K3 | 15. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}+$ | P×P |
| 7. B-N3 | P-QN4 | 16. $Q \times R$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{N}$ |
| 8. P-B4 | B-N2 | 17. Q-R7+ | K-K3 |
| 9. $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | P-N5 | 18. Q-N8- | Resigns |

The second annual tournament for the unior championship of New York City, sponsored by the Manhattan Chess Club under the auspices of the United States Chess Federation, was, in a word, a success. Twenty-four teen-agers, representng the cream of the youthful Chess talent in the Metropolitan Area, came forth to do battle on the sixty-four. The coveted title of Junior Champion of New York City was at stake.
Under the direction of Aben Rudy, well known in New York Chess circles, Julius Stoppock, a teacher with the N.Y.C. Board of Education, and your writer, the six-round swiss system tournament went off rather smoothly with none of the usual incidents so common in many of our 'better' tournaments. For their untiring efforts in organizing, directing, and making the tournament an overall success, special thanks are due Aben Rudy and Julius Stoppock who must have walked at least fifteen miles each round, setting up clocks, giving out score sheets, and scoring the results. Honorable mention must also be given to the management of the Henry Hudson Hotel who gave us the playing space for the event free of charge.
About the tournament in general: The Chess was lively and interesting with few short draws to mar the keen competition that was so apparent. Two youngsters withdrew after the fourth round. Their withdrawals, I suppose, may be attributed to the fact that, having had little or no tournament experience, they became discouraged with their poor showing, Better luck next time.
Last year's champion, Bernard Zuckerman did not defend his title; however, this fact in no way detracted from the fine victory of the new champion, 19 -year-old Asa Hoffmann. He scored four wins and drew two with Roy Benedek and runner-up Arnold Bernstein respectively. Asa did have some anxious moments. Against Frank Hill, he was a
rook and bishop down, for four pawns of course, but the redoubtable Asa managed to pull of a mate in the time scramble! After that it was clear sailing and a final round draw clinched the title for him.

Solid play gave Arnold Bernstein second prize with $4 \frac{1}{2}-1 \frac{1}{2}$. Also with $41 / 2$ points but third on the tie breaking system was Peter Irwin of Summit, New Jersey. Unfortunately for Pete he arrived late for the first round and so forfeited that point. He drew his second round encounter and then won his last four games for a well earned third place. Irwin expects to compete in the U.S. Junior Championship. He should do well. Best of luck!

Alan Staub, a twenty year old student at Columbia University took fourth place with $41 / 2$ points. His all too frequent battles with the clock caused him to falter at the crucial stages. His place too was well earned.

The remaining prize winners were Douglas Binsberg and Sandy Zabell 5th and 6th with 4 points, Gilbert Goon, William Goichberg, and Anthony Sgro, 7th, 8th and 9th respectively with $31 / 2$ points and Roy Benedek 10th with 3 points.
For the reader's enjoyment I present a few lightly annotated games.
FROM THE WINNER'S CIRCLE: A quick attack, a sudden exchange of queens and a surprise win of a piece wraps it up for the Junior Champion.

## SICILIAN DEFENSE

hoffmann

| H. |  | BLECHAR |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 1. | P-K4 | P-QB4 | 6. | N-QB3 | N-B3 |
| 2. | N-KB3 | N-QB3 | 7. | B-QB4 | O-O |
| 3. | P-Q4 | PxP | 8. | B-N3 | N-KN5 |
| 4. | NxP | P-KN3 | 9. | QxN | NxN |
| 5. | B-K3 | B-N2 | 10. | Q-Q1 | N-B3 |

Better alternatives are $10 . \ldots . \mathrm{NxB}$ or 10. .... P-K4. The retreat only affords white the time to build up an irresistible attack.

| 11. Q-Q2 | P-N3 | 14. BxB | KxB |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 12. B-R6 | B-R3 | 15. P-R5 | R-R1 |
| 13. P-KR4 | R-K1 | 16. $0.0-0$ | N-R4 |

If 16. .... P.Q3 then BxP and if KxB , Q-Q5+ and white wins the pawn anyway.


In the following game Black exacts swift retribution for white's pawn grab in the center. Many players would have been enticed by 17. .... RxP+ winning only a pawn, but not young Irwin.
The next game is amusing if not all exactly sound. All I can say is that no comment is necessary.

| 1. | P-K4 | P-K4 | 8. | PxB | B-R6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. | N-QB3 | N-QB3 | 9. | NxB | QxR+ |
| 3. | B-B4 | B-B4 | 10. | K-Q2 | 0-0.0+ |
| 4. | Q-N4 | P-Q4 | 11. | N-Q5 | QxKP |
| 5. | QxP | PxB | 12. | K-Q1 | RxN+ |
| 6. | QxR | Q-N4 | 13. | B-Q2 | Q-R8+ |
| 7. | P-Q4 | QxP | 14. | K-K2 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 5+$ |

This miniature reminds us veterans of how we used to play. What brilliancies we played! Nobody's perfect, but that's why we enjoy the game.
LAITMAN SOLTIS

| 1. P-K4 | P-K4 | 5. $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | N-QB3 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 2. P-KB4!! | PxP | 6. P-Q4 | P-KN4 |
| 3. N-KB3 | P-Q3 | 7. N-QB3 | B-N2 |
| 4. B-B4 | P-KR3 | 8. K-R1 |  |

## 4. B-B4 P-KR3 8. K-R1

An unusual move played with the idea of getting into a variation of the Muzio Gambit. N-Q5 followed by P-B3 is the normal continuation.
8. ........ KN-K2 $\quad$ 9. P-KR3 B-Q2? Necessary is $0-0$ or N-N3.
10. N-K2 P-B4?!

Black has nerves of steel or, shall I say, some nerve.

| 11. N-B3 | PxP | 14. Q-K2 | P-Q4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 12. N-K5! | NxN | 15. | NxQP |
| NxN |  |  |  |
| 13. PxN | B-B4 | 16. | Q-R5+ |
| K-B1 |  |  |  |

After K-K2 white's task becomes somewhat more difficult. A possible line is: 16. ........ K-K2, 17. BxP PxB, 18. QxB P-B3 and white's attack seems to come to a standstill.
17. RxP PxR 18. QxB+ N-B3

After K-K2 it is not easy to find a practical procedure for white. Then again, in junior tournaments who's practical?

## 19. B-Q2 Q-K2

Here Black offered a draw! He certainly knows when he's well off.
20. B-B3
K-K1
22. BxB
Black
Resigns

## CHESS

# KALEIDOSCOPE 

## by U.S. Master ELIOT HEARST

## PETROSIAN TURNS BACK THE CLOCK

V. Vassilev, in "Chess Silhouettes", relates the following details about the childhood of Botvinnik's 1963 challenger:
"Tigran, the youngest son in the Petrosian family, pleased his father and mother not only with his talent in board games but also by his fine grades in school. Tigran differed from his classmates by treating his days in school as if they were a vacation. Sometimes he would get up late at night, tiptoe to the clock, and advance the hands by one hour, in order to get to school earlier. As he left the house, he would surreptitiously move the hands back. His elders noticed this innocent trick, but merely chuckled at it-all the more so since the boy received straight A's at school.

Petrosian learned chess early, too. His tirst contacts with the game were casual and his interest did not develop immediately. In the Army Officers' Club, where his father worked, movies were often shown and little Petrosian was always present. He came an hour and a half before the show, listened to music, leafed through magazines, and stood in the foyer watching the officers play chess. There is a legend that Capablanca learned to play chess solely by watching others, without asking for or being taught the moves. Petrosian, who in the future would be so often compared to the famous Cuban, also looked on silently-but he didn't understand a thing. Because of his natural reserve, he was bashful about questioning strangers. But, be that as it may, his love for chess blossomed and from that time on his interest in the 32 wooden pieces never waned."

## GRANDMASTER DIALOGUE

What happens during the post-mortem of a game between two world championship contenders? A reporter for the Latvian chess journal SAHS sat down next to Tal and Petrosian after their game in the USSR Team Championship and recorded their conversation with each other during the post-game analysis. What was particularly amazing, he notes, was the speed with which they replayed and analyzed the game. The entire post-mortem didn't take more than five or ten minutes! Here is the game with the comment of the two contestants:

## CARO-KANN DEFENSE

White: M. Tal

| 1. | P-K4 | P-QB3 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 2. | P-Q4 | P-Q4 |
| 3. | N-QB3 | PxP |
| 4. | NxP | B-B4 |
| 5. | N-N3 | B-N3 |
| 6. | N-B3 | N-Q2 |
| 7. | B-QB4 | P-K3 |
| 8. | O-O | KN-B3 |
| 9. | N-N5 | $\ldots \ldots .$. |

Petrosian: A funny idea!
Tal: I wanted to transfer the knight to KB4 without having played the weakening P-KR4.

| 9. |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| 10....... | P-KR3 |
| 11. N-B4 | B-Q3 |
| 12. BxB | BxN |
| 13. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |

Petrosian: I don't know which side has won a tempo here!
Tal: I'm not sure either, but my blacksquared bishop seems endowed with life.
13.
14. B-Q3
Q-R5
al: I got tired of that bishop on KN6 "supervising" me all the time.

## 14. <br> 15. QxB

Petrosian: I had to strive for a twoedged fight, since after O-O I have a bad game.
16. R-Q1 $\quad \mathrm{N}(2)$-B3

Petrosian: I did not choose 16. P-KB4 because I was afraid of 17 . P-QB4, N(4)-B3; 18. P-Q5.
Tal: But I intended on 17. ........, N(4)-B3 to play 18. Q-R3.

> 17. P-QB4 N-B2

Tal: Bravo, Tigran, a colossal move!

| 18. P-N4 | R-Q2 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 19. B-N2 | KR-Q1 |
| 20. Q-K2 | Q-N5! |
| 21. P-B3 | Q-N3 |
| 22. P-QR4 | P-KR4! |

Petrosian: In order to make progress one must counterattack!

| 23. P-N5 | P-R5 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 24. PxP | PxP |
| 25. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 4$ |  |

Tal: On 25. N-B1, N-R4 followed by NB5 is strong.

| 25. | NxN |
| :--- | ---: |
| 26. PxN | P-R6 |
| 27. P-N3 | P-KB4! |
| 28. P-K5 | $\ldots . . .$. |



Tal: I overlooked your 35th move, PQR4. Here I considered 28. QR-N1, P-B4; 29. P-Q5, PxKP; 30. B-B3, Px QP; 31. Q-QN2, Q-N3 and saw that it led to a draw by repetition. I couldn't find a way to improve my play.

| 28. $\ldots \ldots .$. | P-B4! |
| :--- | ---: |
| 29. $P \times P$ | RxRch |
| 30. R×R | R×Rch |
| 31. QxR | Q-K1 |
| 32. Q-Q6 | K-N2 |
| 33. P-B6ch | $\ldots . .$. |

Petrosian: The only move!
Tal: But the only move for what?

| 33. $\ldots \ldots \ldots$ | QxP |
| :--- | :--- |
| 34. QxQch | KxQ |
| 35. B-Q4 | P-R4 |

Tal: Here I decided that the game should be a draw. I had expected 35 . ......., P-R3 and after 36. P-R5 and 37. P-N4, I would have had good chances.

| 36. B-B3 | N-R3 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 37. BxP | N-B4 |
| 38. B-N4 | NxP |
| 39. P-N4 | PxP |
| 40. K-B2 | N-N7 |
| 41. K-N3 | NxP |
| 42. KxP | NxPch |
| 43. KxP | K-Q4 |
| 44. K-R4 | K-B5 |
| 45. B-Q6 | N-B2 |
| 46. B-B7 | P-N3 |
| 47. K-N4 | K-Q4 |
| 48. P-R4 | K-K5 |
| 49. P-R5 | N-K4ch |

Petrosian: The whole opening variation was unpleasant for me. Black must struggle too hard for a draw.
Tal said nothing but smiled slyly.
WORLD CHAMPION
PREDICTIONS
Before the Candidates Tourney at Curacao, where Petrosian qualified to play Botvinnik in 1963, ex-world champion Max Euwe (1935-37) made the
following comments (FIDE REVUE; \#2,1962). Are predictions more interesting to read before or after you know the outcome?
"Any of the participants in the match could become the winner-it is absolutely impossible to predict the results!

Sometimes I have the feeling that Pe trosian will win the contest. He is a solid player who picks up his whole and half points in a quiet, unspectacular way. Still, it will be difficult for him to keep pace with hurricanes such as Tal unleased in the Candidates' Tournament of 1959 or Fischer in the recent Interzonal.

One can well ask: Will this be a quiet tournament governed by the motto "Safety First," a tournament with 60$70 \%$ draws and with a winner who will score $60-65 \%$ of his points? In that case, Petrosian would have very good chances, but so would Fischer, who in the recent Interzonal showed wonderful inventiveness, endurance and outstanding command of endgame technique.
However, in the presence of two prominent representatives of the romantic school, the ex-world champion Tal and the permanent "almost" world champion Keres, one can hardly imagine a quiet performance. Rather, the opposite must be expected - a struggle in which pieces are tossed to and fro.

In view of this supposition who will be the winner? Tal has shown in the

Bled tournament of September 1961 that he was not in any way affected by depression or other psychological disorders arising from the lost title. He is only 25 , Keres is already 46, but the world champion Botvinnik is approaching his 51st birthday. Keres did not play well in the last Russian Championship at Baku, December 1961. But Tal did only a little better. Spassky was the man of Baku! Is this a bad omen for Keres or Tal? It is one of the characteristics of romantic, artistic playerstheir ways lead to the desired goal via hills and valleys. Keres or Tal? One cannot put the question in this way, for Fischer is still to be reckoned with, and in a wildly moving competition, Geller will have his word as well.

I have asked several experts their opinion on Fischer's chances. The general consensus was that should Fischer not succeed this time, he is bound to become the winner of the Candidates'. An interesting prophecy which means something. To be sure of victory in a chess tournament which, to a certain extent, remains a gamble, it is not sufficient to be first among equals-you must be by far the best! Fischer's progress, especially this past year, is so overwhelming and impressive that in a few years he will be irresistible. In other words, according to the prophecy cited, Fischer will be World Champion in 1966. This does not help for the

Curacao event, however. It is certain that Fischer has fair chances, but so does Tal, and so do Keres and Petrosian, Geller, Korchnoi, Filip and Benko."

## HOW WRONG CAN YOU BE?

Prof. Elo, USCF rating trailblazer, writes to point out that the Kaleidoscope prognostications for the Curacao tourney (May '62) exactly match the re-cently-compiled numerical ratings of the international competitors:

| Fischer | . 2713 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Tal | . 2706 |
| Petrosian | . 2674 |
| Keres | . 2670 |
| Korchnoi | 2667 |
| Geller | . 2655 |
| Filip | . 2618 |
| Benko | . 2573 |

This proves that "Kaleidoscope" can accurately predict USCF ratings, and that USCF ratings can accurately predict the Kaleidoscope judgments. Unfortunately, neither one was particularly successful in picking the final standings at Curacaot

Thanks are due to Richard Somerville and Michael Dutko for help in the translation of some of the above Russian material. Please send all suggestions and contributions for this column to Eliot Hearst, Arlington Towers J-1125, Arlington 9, Va.


## CRESCENT CITY RESERVE

Jack Randolph (4-1) went undefeated in the Crescent City Reserve and captured the title. Lee Johnson, Herb Mead, Richard Rosenbaum and Wesley Nail, all with $31 / 2$ pts., finished 2nd thru 5 th on Median. All five players tallied three wins; Jack had the advantage of two draws. Al Levitt of the New Orleans Chess Club directed.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ANS-1 | UEEN'S GAMBIT |  |  |
| 1. | P-Q4 | P-Q4 | 23. $\mathrm{N} \cdot \mathrm{N} 4$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 4$ |
| 2. | P-QB4 | PxP | 24. Q-B2 | N (4) $\times \mathrm{N}$ |
| 3. | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{KB3}$ | P-QR3 | 25. $Q \times B$ | N-K4 |
| 4. | P-K3 | B-N5 | 26. Q-K3 | N-R4 |
| 5. | BxP | P-K3 | 27. $\mathrm{R} \cdot(\mathbf{2}) \cdot \mathrm{N} 1$ | K-N2 |
| 6. | Q-N3 | BxN | 28. R-QB1 | Q-B3 |
| 7. | PxB | P-QN4 | 29. KR-Q1 | N-B5 |
| 8. | B-K2 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{KB3}$ | 30. B-B1 | P-R3 |
| 9. | P-QR4 | P-N5 | 31. P-N3 | Q-N4 |
| 10. | N-Q2 | QN-Q2 | 32. R-B5 | K-R2 |
| 11. | 0.0 | P-B4 | 33. R-Q7 | K-N1 |
| 12. | PxP | BxP | 34. $\mathrm{R}(7)-\mathrm{B7}$ | K-N2 |
| 13. | N-B4 | 0.0 | 35. R-B8 | $\mathbf{R \times R}$ |
| 14. | K-R1 | P-QR4 | 36. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ | N-Q2 |
| 15. | B-Q2 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q4}$ | 37. Q-Q4ch | Q-K4 |
| 16. | R-KNI | B-K2 | 38. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{N}$ | Q-R8 |
| 17. | P-K4 | N(4)-B3 | 39. Q-N5 | P-N4 |
| 18 | B-R6 | P-N3 | 40. P-R3 | Q-K8 |
| 19. | BxR | QxB | 41. R-B2 | Q-Q8 |
| 20. | QR-Q1 | B-B4 | 42. Q-B4 | QxPch |
| 21. | R-N2 | Q-N1 | 43. K-R2 | Resigns |
|  | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | Q-B5 |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{ATCH}$ | SCORE: EVANS | 4; LOMB | RDY 3 |
|  |  | GAME EIG | GHT |  |
| LOMBARDY-0 EVANS-1 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | NIMZO-INDIAN | DEFENSE |  |
| 1. | P.Q4 | N-KB3 | 23. PxP | N-Q4 |
| 2. | P-QB4 | P-K3 | 24. Q-R5 | KR-QB1 |
| 3. | N-QB3 | B-N5 | 25. QR-N1 | K-R2 |
| 4. | P-QR3 | BxNch | 26. $\mathrm{R}(5)-\mathrm{N} 4$ | QxP(6) |
| 5. | PxB | P-B4 | 27. R-QR4 | $\mathbf{R x P}$ |
| 6. | P-K3 | Q-R4 | 28. Q-R6 | Q-B7 |
| 7. | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | PxP | 29. R-KB1 | R-B3 |
| 8. | KPxP | O-O | 30. Q-R5 | P-R3 |
| 9. | B-Q2 | N-K5 | 31. R-Q4 | R-QN1 |
| 10 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | NxB | 32. Q-K1 | R-N6 |
| 11. | QxN | P.Q4 | 33. P-QR4 | R(3)-N3 |
| 12 | B-K2 | PxP | 34. R-Q2 | Q-N3 |
| 13. | 0.0 | N-Q2 | 35. Q-R1 | R-N8 |
| 14. | BxP | N-B3 | 36. Q-Q4 | R(3)-N5 |
| 15 | B-K2 | B-Q2 | 37. Q-B5 | RxP |
| 16. | B-B3 | B-B3 | 38. P-R3 | R(5)-R8 |
| 17 | BxB | PxB | 39. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ | QxRch |
| 18. | KR-N1 | P-KR3 | 40. N-B1 | QxNch |
| 19. | Q-Q3 | KR-Q1 | 41. K-R2 | P-B4 |
| 20 | Q-B4 | Q-Q4 | 42. Q-B6 | P-B5 |
| 21 | Q-R6 | P.B4 | Resigns |  |
| 22. R-N5 Q-B5 |  |  |  |  |
|  | ATCH S | SCORE: LOMBA | ARDY 3; E | VANS 5 |


| EVANS-1/2 | GAME NINE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOM | DY-1/2 |
|  | KING'S INDIAN | EFENSE |  |
| 1. P-Q4 | N-KB3 | 26. Q-K3 | QxQ |
| 2. P-QB4 | P-KN3 | 27. R×Q | P.B4 |
| 3. P-KN3 | B-N2 | 28. N-N4 | N-B3 |
| 4. B-N2 | 0.0 | 29. P-B3 | K-B2 |
| 5. N-QB3 | P-Q3 | 30. $\mathrm{R}(3)-\mathrm{K} 1$ | PxP |
| 6. N-B3 | QN-Q2 | 31. PXP | K-K2 |
| 7. 0.0 | P-K4 | 32. QR-B1 | R-KB1 |
| B. P-K4 | P-B3 | 33. B-N2 | N-K1 |
| 9. P-KR3 | Q-N3 | 34. R-B1 | N-B2 |
| 10. P-QS | N-B4 | 35. RxR | RxR |
| 11. Q-B2 | PxP | 36. K-N1 | N(2)-R3 |
| 12. BPXP | B-Q2 | 37. NxN | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}$ |
| 13. B-K3 | P.QR4 | 38. P-QN4 | PxPe.p. |
| 14. KR-B1 | KR-B1 | 39. NxP | R-QR1 |
| 15. N-Q2 | Q-Q1 | 40. R-B3 | N-N1 |
| 16. B-B1 | P-QN4 | 41. N-Q2 | R-R5 |
| 17. P-R3 | N-R5 | 42. K-B2 | N-R3 |
| 18. Q-N3 | N-B4 | 43. P-KR4 | N-B4 |
| 19. Q-B2 | Q-K1 | 44. B-B3 | P-R3 |
| 20. Q-N1 | P-R5 | 45. K-K3 | P-N4 |
| 21. K-R2 | QR-N1 | 46. $P \times P$ | PxP |
| 22. N-R2 | Q-B1 | 47. B-Q1 | R-R1 |
| 23. R-B3 | B-R3 | 48. K-B2 | R-B1ch |
| 24. Q-KI | N-R4 | 49. K-N2 | R-KR1 |
| 25. BxB | QxB | 50. B-B2 | R-R1 |

This deciding game continued for 31 moves more, nelther side making headway, and was drawn by repetition of moves.
MATCH SCORE: EVANS $51 / 2$; LOMBARDY $31 / 2$

## hUNTSVILLE WINS AGAIN

The Birmington (Ala.) Chess club again bowed to the Huntsville Chess Club, $81 / 2 \cdot 51 / 2$, in the return match on June 3. The Huntsville Club is now Alabama's largest, with 60 members.

San Antonio, Texas

| Players' Nam | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 910 | 10 11 | 12 | 12 S | Sc. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Medina, A. ...............W92 | W48 | W19 | W23 | D3 | W31 | D2 | 15 W | W32 | W17 | W4 | W18 |  |
| 2. Benko, P. ..................W55 | W51 | W24 | W20 | W13 | D5 | D1 | 14 W | W34 | W6 | W12 | D3 | $9 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 3. Lombardy, W. ........W63 | W78 | W32 | W31 | D1 | D4 | D20 | W21 | W18 | D5 | W8 | D2 | $9 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 4. Bisguier, A. ..............W80 | W71 | W15 | D7 | W8 | D3 | W23 | W2 D | D6 | W12 L | L1 | D5 | 9 |
| 5. Byrne, R. ..................W64 | W85 | D21 | W22 | W10 | D2 | W14 | W1 L | L12 | D3 | W31 | D4 | 9 |
| 6. Harrow, M. ...............W82 | W66 | L. 12 | W75 | W135 | D7 | W22 | W20 D | D4 | L2 | W14 | W13 | 9 |
| 7. O'Keefe, J. ..............W68 | D49 | W73 | D4 | W21 | D6 | W24 | 1.12 | D20 | W34 | W36 | D10 | $8 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 8. Fernandex-Leon, J. ..W123 | W40 | W33 | D9 | $L 4$ | D45 | D85 | W48 | W26 | W11 | L. 3 | W12 | 81 |
| 9. Burger, K. ..............W102 | W46 | W50 | D8 | D26 | 123 | W16 | D11 L | L. 21 | W48 | W24 | W22 | $8 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 10. Davila, E. ..................W65 | D52 | W130 | W15 | L5 | L. 22 | W30 | D50 V | W47 | W29 | W32 | D7 | 81 |
| 11. Małzner, S. ..............W104 | L69 | W83 | D66 | W49 | W35 | D43 | D9 | W23 | L8 | W20 | W3 | $8 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 12. Jones, S. .................W76 | W103 | W6 | L21 | W34 | W71 | W18 | W7 W | W5 | $L 4$ | L2 | L8 | 8 |
| 13. Szedlacsek, L. ........W89 | W45 | W16 | W36 | L2 | L14 | W52 | L32 | W78 | W6 | W2 | 1.6 | 8 |
| 14. Sandrin, A. ...............W86 | D37 | D59 | W53 | W42 | W13 | L5 | 234 | W46 | W43 | L6 | W3 | 8 |
| 15. Finegold, R. ............W56 | W47 | 14 | L10 | W121 | D130 | D35 | W65 | W38 | L18 | W4 | W34 | 8 |
| 16. Sullivan, J. ..............W77 | W81 | L13 | W69 | L18 | W82 | L9 | W79 | W35 | D20 | D17 | W53 | 8 |
| 17. Lapiken, P. ...............W70 | L33 | W37 | D45 | 144 | W60 | W13 | W47 | W27 | L1 | D16 | W41 | 8 |
| 18. Gilden, L. ...............W67 | W42 | D22 | D52 | W16 | W36 | L12 | W25 L | L3 | W1 | W23 | L1 | 8 |
| 19. Payne, J. ..................W126 | W54 | L1 | W33 | D43 | D44 | 166 | 135 | W7 | W79 | W37 | W3 |  |
| 20. Zuckerman, B. .......W101 | W38 | W2 | L2 | W52 | W26 | D3 | L6 D7 | D7 | D16 | L11 | W48 | 1 |
| 21. Formanek, E. ...........W118 | W87 | D5 | W1 | 17 | W40 | W3 | L3 W | W9 | D31 | L13 | D23 | $7 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 22. McCormick, E. .......W100 | W61 | D18 | L. 5 | W4 | W10 | L6 | W3 | L31 | W84 | W25 | L9 | 1 |
| 23. Smith, K. .................W99 | W75 | W28 | L1 | W78 | W9 | L4 | W66 | L11 | W44 | L18 | D2 | $7 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 24. Saltzberg, M. ...........W91 | W | L2 | W59 | D40 | W48 | L7 | L44 | W81 | W53 | 19 | W46 |  |
| 25. Burgar, W. ...............W121 | D130 | D35 | D38 | D66 | W59 | W45 | L18 | D42 | W30 | L22 | W43 |  |
| 26. Brieger, R. ..............D95 | W94 | W37 | W49 | D9 | L20 | D44 | W11 | L8 | D42 | D46 | W47 |  |
| 27. Lux, T. ....................W54 | W138 | 120 | L43 | W70 | L.37 | W67 | W11 | 1.17 | W61 | W66 | D29 | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| 28. Burkett, M. ..............W117 | W57 | L23 | W80 | L31 | W58 | L34 | D81 | W63 | D33 | D43 | W54 | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| 29. Irwin, P. .................W129 | D59 | L49 | W111 | D47 | L66 | W55 | W45 | W85 | L10 | W44 | D27 | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| 30. Suraci, | D95 | W123 | L82 | W107 | D88 | L10 | W97 | W60 | L25 | W8 | W58 | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| 31. Lyman, S. ..............W97 | W53 | W135 | L3 | W28 | L1 | W78 | D36 | W22 | D21 | L5 | L19 |  |
| 32. Morgan, C | W62 | L3 | 140 | W99 | W6 | W37 | W13 | L1 | W36 | L10 | L11 |  |
| 33. Hidalgo, C. .............W110 | W17 | L8 | L19 | L56 | W126 | D97 | W54 | W3 | D28 | W51 | L14 |  |
| 34. Cunningham, W. ...L83 | W139 | W92 | W46 | L12 | W75 | W28 | W14 | 12 | 17 | W38 | L15 |  |
| 35. Zangerle, K. ...........D108 | W72 | D25 | D71 | W82 | 111 | D15 | W19 | L16 | D41 | W6 | D36 |  |
| 36. Marchand, E. ...........W107 | W44 | W69 | L13 | W85 | L18 | W46 | D31 | W54 | L32 | 17 | D35 |  |
| 37. Jenkins, T. ..............W111 | D14 | 126 | D108 | W54 | W27 | L32 | L38 | W101 | W85 | L19 | W80 |  |
| 38. Smith, G. .................W120 | L20 | W10 | D25 | L39 | D55 | W82 | W37 | L15 | W56 | L34 | W67 |  |
| 39. Slifer, W. ..................L138 | W119 | D41 | W62 | W38 | W53 | L21 | $\underline{L 22}$ | L33 | W80 | D61 | W66 | 7 |
| 40. Tiers, G. ..................W133 | L | W54 | W32 | D24 | L21 | D47 | L78 | W67 | L51 | W99 | W47 |  |
| 41. Street, F. ..................WF | 50 | D39 | W61 | L22 | 179 | W95 | W68 | W52 | D35 | W42 | 117 | 7 |
| 42. Shaw, J. ..................W127 | L18 | W107 | W115 | 114 | D128 | D79 | W99 | D25 | D26 | 141 | W72 | 7 |
| 43. Mclirath, J. ...........W141 | L24 | W90 | W27 | D19 | W50 | D11 | D85 | D44 | 114 | D28 | $\underline{L 25}$ | $6 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 44. Castle, R. ..................W124 | 36 | D55 | W122 | W17 | D19 | D26 | W24 | D43 | L23 | L29 | D51 | $6 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 45. Rohland, M. ............WF144 | L13 | W95 | D17 | W96 | D8 | L25 | L29 | W64 | W78 | L15 | D55 | $6 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 46. Berry, G. .................W96 | L9 | W91 | L34 | W86 | W67 | L36 | W56 | L14 | W99 | D26 | L24 | $6 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 47. Kane, G. .................W128 | L15 | W116 | D50 | D29 | WF135 | D40 | $L 17$ | L10 | W70 | W82 | L26 | $6 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 48. Christman, J. ...........W131 | L1 | W86 | D96 | W79 | L24 | W128 | L8 | W111 | L9 | W63 | $\underline{L} 2$ | $6 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 49. Slater, K. ..................W125 | D7 | W29 | $\mathbf{L 2 6}$ | L11 | W57 | L50 | D64 | 179 | D86 | W90 | W87 | $6 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 50. Mego, J. ..................W119 | W4 | L9 | D47 | W60 | L43 | W49 | D10 | L66 | L58 | W74 | D62 | $6 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 51. Stevens, B. ..............W106 | L2 | L85 | D68 | W61 | W64 | L111 | D83 | W55 | W40 | L33 | D44 | $6 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 52. Schmidt, B. ...........W1 | D10 | W108 | D18 | L20 | W81 | L13 | D53 | L41 | 183 | W107 | W84 | $6 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 53. Fisher, P. ..............W103 | L31 | W126 | L14 | W104 | L39 | W70 | D52 | W88 | L24 | W83 | L. 16 | $6 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 54. Medina, J. ..............L27 | WF144 | L40 | W83 | L37 | W80 | D58 | L33 | W116 | W88 | W84 | L28 | $6 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 55. Burlingame, M. ....... $\mathbf{L 2}$ | W117 | D44 | W140 | L71 | D38 | L29 | W91 | 151 | W95 | W78 | D45 | $6 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 56. Edwards, D. ............L15 | L128 | W114 | W74 | W33 | 178 | W62 | L46 | W126 | L38 | D59 | W81 | $6 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 57. Weeks, H. ...............W74 | L28 | L80 | W98 | D64 | L49 | L89 | W119 | W87 | W60 | W69 | L40 | $6 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 58. Stallings, J. ...........L87 | W98 | W93 | L135 | W116 | L28 | D54 | D88 | W118 | W50 | D62 | L30 | 61 |
| 59. Faust, E. ..................W93 | D29 | D14 | L24 | W117 | L25 | 1.99 | L107 | W120 | W123 | D56 | W92 | 61 |
| 60. Gardner, A. M. ........W140 | L12 | D79 | W65 | L50 | L17 | W77 | W128 | L30 | L57 | W94 | W104 | $6 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 61. Dorne, W. ..............W79 | L22 | D128 | 441 | L51 | W110 | W98 | D86 | W115 | L27 | D39 | W83 | $6 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 62. McKinney, H. ...........W113 | L32 | D122 | L39 | D77 | W100 | L56 | W104 | D107 | W89 | D58 | D50 | 61 |
| 63. Denney, D. ..............L3 | 490 | W120 | W126 | W108 | L85 | D88 | W73 | L28 | W97 | L48 | W93 | $6 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 64. Waid, C. .................L5 | W127 | L115 | W100 | D57 | L51 | W103 | D49 | L45 | W118 | D85 | W82 | 6 |
| 65. Cramer, F. ..............L10 | W112 | D77 | L60 | W102 | D96 | W107 | L15 | L99 | W98 | D93 | W85 | 62 |
| 66. Spence, J. ...............W105 | L6 | W118 | D11 | D25 | W29 | W19 | L23 | W50 | LT3 | L27 | L39 | 6 |
| 67. Rogosin, D. ..............L18 | W120 | $L 17$ | W76 | W140 | L46 | L27 | W117 | L40 | W115 | W75 | L38 | 6 |
| 68. Richardson, T. .......L7 | W88 | L75 | D51 | W73 | L84 | W92 | L41 | W102 | W72 | L35 | D70 | 6 |
| 69. Slater, W. ..............W137 | W11 | L36 | L16 | W118 | L32 | W116 | L84 | D89 | W107 | L57 | D71 | 6 |
| 70. Goddard, A. ...........L17 | D111 | W72 | W130 | L27 | WF140 | L53 | D87 | W100 | L47 | W118 | D68 | 6 |
| 71. Freeman, R. ...........W142 | L4 | W121 | D35 | W55 | L12 | L84 | D89 | D83 | 182 | W86 | D69 | 6 |
| 72. Shelburn, R. ...........D73 | L35 | 170 | W131 | W122 | L111 | D91 | W96 | W86 | 168 | W79 | 142 | 6 |
| 73. Crenstein, J. ...........D72 | W109 | L7 | 179 | 168 | W123 | W102 | L63 | 182 | W126 | D89 | W100 | 0 |
| 74. Weaver, E. F. ........L57 | L116 | W127 | L56 | W142 | D77 | D117 | W129 | L19 | W103 | L50 | W98 | 6 |
| 75. Jewell, C. .............W122 | $2 \mathrm{~L}^{2}$ | W68 | L6 | W91 | L34 | 1115 | LF118 | W76 | W101 | L67 | W99 | 6 |
| 76. Ragsdale, J. ...........L12 | L140 | W134 | 1.67 | 1.87 | W124 | L80 | W110 | 475 | W132 | W123 | W95 | 6 |
| 77. Neumann, V. ...........L. 16 | W13 | D65 | 178 | D62 | D74 | $L 60$ | $L 95$ | D132 | W122 | W97 | D89 | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 78. Reynolds, D. ...........W116 | L3 | W89 | W77 | L23 | W56 | L31 | W40 | L13 | L45 | L55 | D79 | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 79. Smith, T. ..................L61 | W100 | D60 | W73 | 148 | W41 | D42 | L16 | W49 | L19 | 572 | D78 | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 80. Perry, O. ..................L4 | W106 | W57 | L28 | 1.88 | L54 | W76 | D100 | W92 | L39 | L111 | L37 | 51 |
| 81. Bullockus, T. ...........W136 | L16 | W87 | L85 | W90 | 152 | W96 | D28 | L24 | WF111 | L30 | L56 | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 82. Sims, D. .................L6 | W105 | W101 | W30 | L35 | 1.16 | L38 | D116 | W73 | W71 | L47 | L64 | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 83. Garber, M. ...............W34 | L135 | L11 | L.54 | W127 | D117 | W108 | D51 | D71 | W52 | 153 | L61 | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 84. Rubin, S. .................WW114 | L19 | 1.96 | D128 | W123 | W68 | W71 | W69 | 136 | 122 | L54 | L52 | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 85. Aronson, E. ...........W90 | L5 | W51 | W81 | L36 | W63 | D8 | D43 | 429 | 137 | D64 | 465 | 51 |
| 86. Wells, W. N. ...........L14 | W141 | L48 | W103 | L46 | D87 | W125 | D61 | 172 | D49 | L71 | W114 | 451 |
| 87. Pennington, F. .......W58 | L21 | L81 | LF95 | W76 | D86 | D101 | D70 | 1.57 | W91 | W88 | 149 | 51 |
| 88. TorkeIson, L. ...........LF41 | L68 | W112 | W129 | W80 | D30 | D63 | D58 | 153 | L54 | 187 | W108 | 85 |
| 89. Giron, L. .................L13 | W131 | L78 | L121 | W109 | D95 | W57 | D71 | D69 | 162 | D73 | D77 | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 90. Weller, W. ..............L85 | W63 | L. 43 | W97 | L81 | L107 | D126 | $L 92$ | W113 | W102 | L49 | W109 | $95 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 91. Treblow, M. ...........L24 | W113 | L46 | W110 | 175 | D103 | D72 | L55 | D117 | L.87 | W127 | W112 | $25 \frac{1}{1}$ |
| 92. Erkes, R. ..................LI | W142 | L34 | L118 | D94 | W119 | 168 | W90 | 180 | W109 | W114 | L59 | 51 |
| 93. Clyatt, H. ..............L59 | W129 | L58 | L107 | L100 | W127 | W121 | 1 L101 | W131 | W116 | D65 | 163 | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 94. Falbo, C. ..................D30 | L. 26 | D97 | L99 | D92 | L102 | D110 | D121 | W12 | W1 | 60 | WF107 |  |

FERNANDEZ-LEON
s. JONES

| 1. | P-Q4 <br> N.KB3 | $\begin{gathered} \text { P-Q4 } \\ \mathrm{N} \cdot \mathrm{~KB} 3 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3. | P.B4 | P-B3 |
| 4. | N-B3 | P.K3 |
| 5. | B-N5 | PXP |
| 6. | P-QR4 | B-N5 |
| 7. | BxN | PxB |
| 8. | P-KN3 | P-N4 |
| 9. | B-N2 | B-N2 |
| 10. | $0 \cdot 0$ | Q.N3 |
| 11. | P-K4 | P-QR3 |
| 12. | P.Q5 | N-Q2 |
| 13. | PXKP | BPxP |
| 14. | N-Q4 | P-QB4 |
| 15. | Q-R5ch | K-K2 |
| 16. | $\mathrm{N}(4)-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{N} \cdot \mathrm{K} 4$ |
| 17. | P-B4 | N-Q6 |
| 18. | P-K5 | BxB |


| 19. PxPc | Kxp |
| :---: | :---: |
| 20. Q-R6ch | K-K2 |
| 21. KxB | BxN |
| 22. NxB | Q-B3 |
| 23. K-R3 | P-N5 |
| 24. Q-N7ch | K-Q3 |
| 25. QR-QI | KR-KN1 |
| 26. Q-K5ch | K-K2 |
| 27. RxN | PxR |
| 28. N-K4 | QR-KB1 |
| 29. P-B5 | P.Q7 |
| 30. P-B6ch | K-Q1 |
| 31. R-Q1 | R-B2 |
| 32. RxPch | R-Q2 |
| 33. Q-N8ch | Q-B1 |
| 34. RxRch | K×R |
| 35. Q.Q6ch | Resign |

RUY LOPEZ

| G. BERRY |  | D. EDWARDS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. P.K4 | P. K 4 | 20. | N-B6ch | K-R1 |
| 2. $\mathrm{N} \cdot \mathrm{KB3}$ | N-QB3 |  | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{N}$ |
| 3. B-N5 | P-QR3 |  | P-N4 | P.R3 |
| 4. B-R4 | N-B3 |  | B-B4 | N-N3 |
| 5. P-Q4 | PxP |  | BxBP | B-N1 |
| 6. 0.0 | P.Q3 |  | BxB | RxB |
| 7. $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | B-Q2 | 26. | RxP | QxR |
| 8. P-QB4 | B-K2 |  | QxRch | K-R2 |
| 9. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{QB3}$ | $0 \cdot 0$ |  | Q-Q6 | Q-K1 |
| 10. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N}$ | PxB |  | P-KR3 | BxP |
| 11. P-B4 | R-K1 |  | Q-N3 | B-Q2 |
| 12. P.K5 | P×P |  | R-K1 | Q-B2 |
| 13. PxP | N-N5 |  | Q-N3 | Q-B5 |
| 14. B-B4 | B-QB4 |  | Q-Q3 | K-R1 |
| 15. N-K4 | B-R2 |  | R-KB1 | Q-N4 |
| 16. P-BS | NXKP |  | N-B3 | Q-N5 |
| 17. Q-N3 | R-N1 |  | N-K5 | N-B5 |
| 18. Q-N3 | Q-K2 | 37. | $\mathbf{R \times N}$ | QxR |
| 19. B-N5 | Q-B1 |  | N-N6ch | Resigns |

SICILIAN DEFENSE

| L. GILDEN |  | K. SMITH |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. P.K4 | P.QB4 | 23. $R(1)-R 1$ | R-N1 |
| 2. $\mathrm{N} \cdot \mathrm{KB} 3$ | P-QR3 | 24. R(1)-R6 | Q-B1 |
| 3. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | P-K3 | 25. P-QN4 | B-Q1 |
| 4. P-Q4 | PxP | 26. N-B5 | B-QB3 |
| 5. $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | Q-82 | 27. $\mathrm{N}(2)-\mathrm{K} 4$ | B-N3 |
| 6. B-Q3 | N-QB3 | 28. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ | R×R |
| 7. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | B-Q3 | 29. Q-K2 | Q-Q1 |
| 8. Q-N4 | KN-K2 | 30. P-N4 | PxP |
| 9. P-B4 | P.KR4 | 31. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ | BxN |
| 10. Q-B3 | P-QN4 | 32. $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{B}$ | P-B3 |
| 11. P-K5 | B-N5 | 33. Q-N6 | PxP |
| 12. 0.0 | B-N2 | 34. N-N5 | R-B3 |
| 13. N-K4 | N-B4 | 35. R-R8 | QxR |
| 14. Q-B2 | QR-B1 | 36. Q-R7ch | K-B1 |
| 15. B-K3 | NxB | 37. Q-R8ch | K-K2 |
| 16. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | 38. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ | PxP |
| 17. P-QR4 | N-B4 | 39. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | R-N3ch |
| 18. Q-B2 | B-Q4 | 40. K-B2 | N-R5 |
| 19. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | PxP | 41. Q-R8 | N-B4 |
| 20. R-R7 | Q-B3 | 42. Q-R5 | R-R3 |
| 21. $\mathrm{N}(3)-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | 0.0 | 43. Q-N5ch | K-B1 |
| 22. P-B3 | B-K2 | 44. Q-Q8ch | Resigns | KING'S INDIAN

WM. LOMBARDY
L. GILDEN

| 1. | P.QB4 | N-KB3 | 24. B-K3 | BxB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. | P-Q4 | P-KN3 | 25. QxB | QXKP |
| 3. | N-QB3 | B-N2 | 26. Q-QB3 | Q-K4 |
| 4. | P-K4 | P-Q3 | 27. R-Q1 | R-Q1 |
| 5. | P-KR3 | O-O | 28. B-B3 | KR-K1 |
| 6. | B-N5 | N-B3 | 29. B-Q5 | R-K2 |
| 7. | N -B3 | P.KR3 | 30. Q-Q3 | K-N2 |
| 8. | B-K3 | P-K4 | 31. $\mathrm{R}(1)-\mathrm{KB} 1$ | R(1)-Q2 |
| 9. | PXP | NXP(4) | 32. K-R1 | Q-N4 |
| 10. | B-K2 | B-K3 | 33. R-B5 | Q-R5 |
| 11. | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | KN-Q2 | 34. Q-B3ch | Q-Q5 |
| 12. | O-O | P-KN4 | 35. Q-B2 | Q-K6 |
| 13. | R-B1 | N-B4 | 36. $\mathrm{R}(5)-\mathrm{B} 3$ | Q-N4 |
| 14. | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}$ | 37. Q-B2 | Q-R5 |
| 15. | PxN | Q-Q2 | 38. R-N3 | Q-Q5 |
| 16. | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 5$ | P-QR4 | 39. Q-B2 | K-R3 |
| 17. | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | P-N3 | 40. Q-B1ch | K-N2 |
| 18. | P-B4 | PxP | 41. Q-N5 | Q-K4 |
| 19. | R×P | N-N3 | 42. $\mathrm{R} \times$ Pch | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$ |
| 29. | R-B2 | QR-K1 | 43. QxNch | K-B1 |
| 21. | Q-Q2 | P-QB4 | 44. Q-N8ch | K-K2 |
| 22. | NxB | QxN | 45. QxRch | Resigns |
| 23. | BXRP | B-Q5 |  |  |


|  | Wheeler, W. ...........D26 | 30 | L45 | WF87 | L130 | D89 | L41 | W77 | 7 | L55 | 3 | 1.76 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Kelly, J. ...................L46 | W102 | W84 | D48 | L45 | D65 | L81 | $L 72$ | $L 98$ | L. 104 | W122 | 123 | 5 |
|  | Bush, B. .................L31 | D99 | D94 | 190 | W105 | W118 | D33 | $L 30$ | D95 | $L 63$ | 177 | 16 |  |
| 8. | Fuchs, G. ..nntwn.... 32 | $L 58$ | D102 | L57 | W131 | W122 | L61 | D108 | W96 | L65 | W11 | L74 | 5 |
|  | Langer, S. ...............L23 | D97 | D109 | W94 | $L 32$ | W139 | W59 | L42 | W65 | L46 | 140 | $L 75$ | 5 |
| 100. | Leonard, A. ...........L22 | L79 | W136 | L64 | W93 | 1.62 | WF140 | D80 | $L 70$ | D108 | W101 | $L 73$ | 5 |
| 101. | Durio, F. M. ..........L. 20 | W103 | L82 | L.116 | W120 | D108 | D87 | W93 | L37 | L45 | 2.100 | W115 | 5 |
| 102. | Hyde, H. .................L9 | $L 96$ | D98 | W125 | L65 | W94 | $L 73$ | W131 | L68 | $L 90$ | D116 | W117 | 7 |
| 103. | L53 | L101 | W124 | 1.86 | WF129 | D91 | L64 | D123 | W104 | $L 74$ | $L 95$ | W119 | 9 |
| 104. | 11 | W137 | L38 | W113 | L53 | $L 115$ | W139 | 1.62 | 1.103 | W96 | W106 | 59 | 5 |
| 10 | 66 | L82 | L.111 | W134 | 1.97 | L 125 | L124 | W137 | D110 | D119 | W120 | W127 | 7 |
| 106. | kin, W. B. ..........L51 | 480 | L110 | WF126 | 6 L 1 | W133 | 3 L 129 | W124 | L 123 | W129 | L1 | NF118 | 85 |
| 107. | OX, J. ......................36 | W124 | L42 | W93 | L. 3 | W90 | 165 | W59 | D62 | 169 | $L 52$ | LF93 | 41 |
| 108. | Hansen, V. ...............D35 | WF143 | L52 | D37 | L63 | D101 | 183 | D98 | D129 | D100 | D117 | L88 |  |
| 109. | Simpson, F. A. ........D143 | $L 73$ | D99 | L117 | $L 89$ | D114 | L 123 | W112 | W121 | $L 92$ | W126 | $L 95$ |  |
| 110. | Snow, T. ..................L33 | L121 | W106 | L91 | D119 | L61 | D94 | L.76 | D105 | W133 | L112 | W13 |  |
| 111. | L37 | D70 | W105 | L29 | W106 | W72 | W51 | 126 | 148 | LF81 | LF80 | WD | 41 |
| 112. | Creighton, J. ...........L52 | L65 | L88 | L132 | L114 | W134 | D133 | L109 | W124 | W113 | W110 | L91 | 41 |
| 113. | Hoffmann, J. H. ....L62 | $L 91$ | W14 | L104 | L139 | W120 | L. 118 | D122 | L.90 | L 112 | W136 | W126 | 5 |
| 114. | Hoffmann, Mrs. J....L. 84 | L126 | $L 56$ | L120 | W112 | D109 | L131 | W127 | W119 | W117 | 192 | L86 | 41 |
| 115. | Id, $T$. .n.u. LF | W134 | W64 | L42 | L128 | W104 | W75 | L27 | 1.61 | L67 | L98 | L101 | 4 |
| 116. | k, C. ................. L78 | W74 | 147 | W101 | L58 | W121 | L69 | D82 | L. 54 | L93 | D102 | L97 | 4 |
| 11 | gus, C. L. ........L28 | L. 55 | W133 | W109 | L59 | D83 | D74 | L67 | D91 | L 114 | D108 | L102 | 4 |
| 118. | elani, D. ...............L21 | W12 | L66 | W92 | L69 | $L 97$ | W113 | WF7 | L58 | L64 | 1.70 | LF106 | 6 |
| 119. | Y, J. .................. L50 | L39 | W13 | $L 138$ | D110 | $L .92$ | W122 | L57 | L114 | D105 | W125 | L103 | 4 |
| 120. | riguez, C. ........L38 | L67 | L63 | W114 | L101 | $L 113$ | W136 | W13 | $L 59$ | $L 106$ | L105 | W131 | 1 |
| 121. | hurch, G. ...............L25 | W110 | $L 71$ | W89 | L15 | $L 116$ | $L 93$ | D94 | L. 109 | L. 127 | W137 | D124 | 4 |
| 122. | Rock, H. .................L75 | W132 | D62 | L44 | $L 72$ | 198 | $L 119$ | D113 | W136 | L77 | L96 | W137 | 7 |
| 123. | Kreneck, | W133 | L30 | D141 | L84 | L73 | W109 | D103 | W106 | L59 | 176 | L96 | 4 |
| 124. | Boyce, R. A. ...........L44 | L107 | $L 103$ | 1127 | W134 | L76 | W105 | 1106 | L112 | D125 | W132 | D121 | 4 |
| 125. | Stein, R. ............... L49 | 1718 | D131 | $L 102$ | W137 | W10 | L86 | L 126 | $L 94$ | D124 | L119 | W133 | 3 |
| 126. | Irwin, R, .................. L19 | W114 | L53 | L63 | W132 | L33 | D90 | W125 | L56 | L73 | L 109 | $L 113$ |  |
| 127. | $L 42$ | L64 | $L 74$ | W12 | L83 | L93 | D13 | L114 | W134 | W12 | L91 | $L 105$ |  |
| 128. | E. ................. L47 | W56 | D61 | D84 | W115 | D42 | L48 | L60 | WD | WD | WD | WD | 3 |
| 129. | hrabsky, R. .......L29 | $L 93$ | W137 | L88 | LF103 | W132 | W106 | L74 | D108 | L94 | WD | WD | 3 |
| 130. | Radaikin, V. ...........W132 | D25 | $L 10$ | D70 | W95 | D15 | $L 17$ | WD | WD | WD | WD | WD | 3 |
| 131. | Carpenter, K. .......L48 | L89 | D125 | 172 | L98 | W137 | W114 | L102 | L93 | L134 | D133 | L120 | 3 |
| 132. | aruso, G. ..............L 130 | L122 | 1119 | W112 | L. 126 | L129 | D127 | W133 | D77 | L76 | L124 | L134 | 3 |
| 133. | loughton, R. .......L40 | L. 123 | L 117 | $L 139$ | W136 | L105 | D112 | L132 | W137 | 189 | D131 | 125 | 3 |
| 134. | Marting, B. ..........LF | 1115 | $L 76$ | L105 | L.124 | L 112 | 1.137 | L136 | 1.127 | W131 | Bye | W132 | 2 |
| 135. | Marks, H. L. ...........W13 | W83 | L.31 | W58 | L6 | LF47 | WD | WD | WD | WD | WD | WD |  |
| 136. | Theis, K. .................L81 | 177 | 1.100 | LF | $L 133$ | Bys | L120 | W134 | L122 | 1137 | L113 | L110 | 2 |
| 137. | E. ........... 669 | L104 | L129 | L 142 | L125 | L.131 | W134 | L 105 | $L 133$ | W136 | L121 | L. 122 | 2 |
| 138. | dmondson, E. ........W39 | L27 | L. 140 | W119 | WD | WD | WD | WD | WD | WD | WD | WD | 2 |
| 139. | Mangus, D. ........... 135 | L34 | L141 | W133 | W113 | $L 99$ | L104 | L120 | WD | WD | WD | WD | 2 |
| 140. | I, C. .......... 60 | W76 | W138 | L55 | L67 | LF70 | LF100 | WD | WD | WD | WD | WD | 2 |
| 141. | bson, J. ..............L43 | L86 | W139 | D123 | WD | WD | WD | WD | WD | WD | WD | WD | 12 |
| 142. | Moen, P. .................L71 | $L 92$ | L 113 | W137 | 174 | WD | WD | WD | WD | WD | WD | WD |  |
| 143. | rame, M. ..n...........D109 | LF103 | WD | WD | WD | WD | WD | WD | WD | WD | WD | WD |  |
| 144. | Wilkerson, S. ........LF45 | LF54 | WD | WD | WD | WD | WD | WD | WD | WD | WD | WD | 0 |



| E. MARCHAND |  |  | J. O'KEEFE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | P-QB4 | N-KB3 | 28. | K-N2 | K-B3 |
| 2. | N-KB3 | P-KN3 | 29. | K-B3 | P-R4 |
| 3. | N-B3 | P-Q4 | 30. | P-R4 | K-K4 |
| 4. | PxP | NxP | 31. | K-K3 | P-B4 |
| 5. | P-KN3 | B-N2 | 32. | PxP | K×Pch |
| 6. | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | P-QB4 | 33. | K-B3 | R-Q3 |
| 7. | O-O | $\mathbf{N x N}$ | 34. | R-B7ch | K-K4 |
| 8. | NPXN | N-B3 | 35. | K-K3 | K-Q4 |
| 9. | B-QR3 | Q-R4 | 36. | R-B4 | K-B4 |
|  | Q-B1 | 0.0 | 37. | P-N4 | PxP |
|  | R-N1 | P-N3 | 38. | R×P | P-QN4 |
| 12. | N-Q4 | PxN | 39. | R-N5ch | K-B5 |
| 13. | BxN | B-R6 | 40. | P-R5 | PxP |
| 14. | BxP | $B \times R$ | 41. | R×RP | P-N5 |
| 15. | $B \times Q R$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ | 42. | R-R8 | K-B6 |
|  | $Q \times B$ | PXP | 43. | R-B8ch | K-N7 |
|  | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | QXRP | 44. | R-QN8 | P-N6 |
| 18. | Q-K1 | R-K1 | 45. | R-QR8 | K-B7 |
| 19. | R-R1 | Q-K3 | 46. | R-B8ch | K-N8 |
| 20. | B-N5 | QXP | 47. | R-QN8 | P-N7 |
| 21. | $Q \times Q$ | R×Q | 48. | R-QRB | K-B8 |
| 22. | Rxp | BxP | 49. | R-B8ch | K-Q8 |
| 23. | B-R6 | R-K1 | 50. | R-QN8 | R-Q7 |
| 24. | R-N7 | B-Q5 | 51. | R-N7 | K-B8 |
| 25. | B-K3 | BxB | 52. | R-N8 | R-QB7 |
| 26. | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ | R-K3 | 53. | Resigns |  |
| 27. | P.1K4 | K-N2 |  |  |  |

GRUENFELD DEFENSE

| S. JONES |  | P. | BENKO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. P-Q4 | N-KB3 | 19. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 4$ | P-B3 |
| 2. P-QB4 | P-KN3 | 20. B-QB4 | P-KN4 |
| 3. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | P-Q4 | 21. KR-K1 | N-Q2 |
| 4. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | B-N2 | 22. Q-R3 | Q-N3 |
| 5. Q-N3 | PxP | 23. N-B5 | NxN |
| 6. QXBP | $0 \cdot 0$ | 24. PXN | Q-N5 |
| 7. P-K4 | N-B3 | 25. $Q \times Q$ | NXQ |
| 8. B-K2 | N-Q2 | 26. $R \times P$ | QR-Q1 |
| 9. B.K3 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | 27. $\mathrm{R}(1)-\mathrm{Q7}$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$ |
| 10. Q-B5 | P-B4 | 28. R×R | P-N4 |
| 11. R-Q1 | PxP | 29. B-K2 | NxP |
| 12. NXP | N-Q4 | 30. B-K3 | P-QR4 |
| 13. B-KN5 | P-KR3 | 31. R-Q6 | N-N5 |
| 14. B-QB4 | B-K3 | 32. P-QN3 | P-R5 |
| 15. B-QB1 | K-R1 | 33. PxP | PxP |
| 16. 0.0 | B-N1 | 34. B-Q4 | P-R6 |
| 17. B-QNS | N-N1 | 35. BxBch | $\mathbf{K \times B}$ |
| 18. N-K5 | B-R2 | 36. Resigns |  |

ENGLISH OPENING

| A. BISGUIER |  |  |  | S. JONES |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 1. P-QB4 | P-K4 | 22. B-N4ch | K-K1 |  |
| 2. | N-QB3 | N-KB3 | 23. B-B5 | N-B2 |
| 3. N-B3 | N-B3 | 24. R-B1 | N-Q3 |  |
| 4. P-QR3 | P-Q4 | 25. R-KB3 | N-B5 |  |
| 5. P-Q4 | PXQP | 26. BxN | BxB |  |
| 6. KNXP | N-K4 | 27. BxP | BxP |  |
| 7. PxP | NxP | 28. BxPch | BxB |  |
| P. N(4)-N5 | NxN | 29. RxB(B6) | B-N5ch |  |
| 9. QxQch | KxQ | 30. N-B3 | R-Q5 |  |
| 10. NxN | P-QB3 | 31. R-K3 | R(1)-Q1 |  |
| 11. P-K4 | B-QB4 | 32. R-B7 | R-QBch |  |
| 12. B-KB4 | P-B3 | 33. K-B2 | R(8)-Q7ch |  |
| 13. N-R4 | B-Q3 | 34. R-K2 | K-B1 |  |
| 14. B-K3 | K-K2 | 35. N-Q5 | B-R4 |  |
| 15. B-K2 | R-Q1 | 36. RxR | BxR(B2) |  |
| 16. P-B4 | N-N5 | 37. R-B2 | B-Q3 |  |
| 17. B-Q2 | P-QN4 | 38. R-B6 | K-B2 |  |
| 18. P-R3 | N-R3 | 39. K-K3 | R-Q2 |  |
| 19. N-B3 | B-QB4 | 40. P-KN3 | B-N1 |  |
| 20. N-Q1 | B-N3 | 41. K-Q4 | P-QR4 |  |
| 21. R-QB1 | B-N2 | 42. K-B4 | Resigns |  |

QUEEN'S PAWN GAME

| R, FREEMAN |  |  | W. WELLS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | P-Q4 | N-KB3 | 9. B-N5 | Q-N3 |
| 2. | P-QB4 | P-K3 | 10. N-K4 | O-0 |
| 3. | $\mathrm{N} \cdot \mathrm{KB} 3$ | P-KN3 | 11. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 6+$ | K-R1 |
| 4. | N-B3 | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | 12. Q-Q2 | N-B3 |
| 5. | P-K4 | P-Q3 | 13. $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}$ | BxN |
| 6. | B-Q3 | P-B4 | 14. B-B6 | Q-B2 |
| 7. | P-K5 | QPxP | 15. Q-R6 | R-KN1 |
| 8. | QPxP | KN-Q2 | 16. N-N5 | Resigns |
|  |  | SICILIAN | DEFENSE |  |
| SURACI |  |  | STALLINGS |  |
| 1. | P-K4 | P.QB4 | 9. P-B4 | Q-B2 |
| 2. | N-KB3 | P.Q3 | 10. Q-B3 | B-Q2 |
| 3. | P.Q4 | PxP | 11. B-K3 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| 4. | NXP | N-KB3 | 12. P-N4 | $\mathbf{N x N}$ |
| 5. | N-QB3 | P-QR3 | 13. BxN | P-K4 |
| 6. | B-QB4 | P.K3 | 14. P-N5 | N-NS |
| 7. | B-N3 | B-K2 | 15. N-Q5 | Q-Q1 |
| 8. | 0.0 | 0.0 | 16. B-N6 | Resigns |

# GAMES <br> BY <br> <br> USCF <br> <br> USCF <br> <br> MEMBERS <br> <br> MEMBERS <br> Annotated by <br> U. S. Master JOHN W. COLLINS 

## CONVINCING REFUTATION

White convincingly refutes his opponent's early attempt at counter-attack.

## Los Angeles League, 1962 QUEEN'S GAMBIT DECLINED MCO 9: p. 188, c. 40

R. Myhro (2000) T. Weinberger (2367)
(Van Nuys 2)
(Steiner A)

1. P-Q4 P-Q4
2. $\mathbf{P x P} \quad \mathbf{P x P}$
3. P-QB4 P-K3
4. B-N5 B-K2
5. N-QB3 N-KB3
6. P-K3 O.O
Or 6. ......... QN-Q2; 7. B-Q3, P-B3; 8. Q-B2, N-B1; 9. N-B3, N-K3; 10. B-R4, P-KN3; 11. O-O, O-O; 12. QR-N1, N-N2; 13. P-QN4, B-KB4=.
$\begin{array}{llllll}\text { 7. } & \text { Q-B2 } & \text { R-K1 } & \text { 9. } & \text { N-B3 } & \text { P-B3 } \\ \text { 8. } & \text { B-Q3 } & \text { QN-Q2 } & \text { 10. } 0-0 & \text { N-B1 }\end{array}$ Or 10. ........, P-KR3; 11. B-R4, N-K5; 12. B-N3, NxB; 13. RPxN, B-Q3=.

## 11. QR-N1 <br> N-K5

Preferable is 11. ........, N-N3.
12. BxB

Petrosian-Vaitonis, Helsinki, 1952, went 12. QB-B4, P-KB4; 13. N-K5, B-B3; 14. P-B3, with an advantage for White.
12. BxN
QxB
14. N-Q2
P×B
........

The White Knights are very effective in the Exchange Variation.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 14. ...... } \\
& \text { 15. P-QN4 }
\end{aligned}
$$

If 15 . P-B3, Q-N4.
15. $\qquad$ N-N3?
Here and on the next move PQR3 is better.
16. KR-B1
QR-Q1
17. P.N5
........

White has heavy queen-side pressure.
17.
R-Q3
18. N-B4
N-R5?

Sacrificing the exchange is unsound. The natural move is 18. ........, R-K3.

> 19. $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{R}$ 20. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 2$

The king-side is adequately defended by this lone piece.
21. PxP, PxP; 22. QxBP is threatened.

| 20. | 23. | B-Q2 | Q-B5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 21. P -N6 | Q-N3 | 24. P-Q5 | ........ |

22. N-N3 P-QR3

Lines for the Queen and Rooks must be opened.

| 24. | Px.... | PxP | 26. QxNP |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 25. QxP | P-KR4 | 27. Q-B6 | N....... |

Not 27. KxN?, P-R5; 28. N-B1???, B-B6 ch; 29. K-R3, Q-N5 mate.


## After 28. QxR!

With a new Queen in the offing, this is the simplest way to end any illusions Black may have.

| 28. | Bxa |
| :---: | :---: |
| 29. P-N7 | N-R5 |
| 30. P-N8= Qch | Resign |

After 30. ........, K-R2; 31. R-B5, White wins easily with the double exchange.

## A BIT OF TAL

It is a bit of Tal which causes Black to rue his fifth and seventh moves.

## Marshall Weekly Tourney New York, 1962 <br> CARO-KANN DEFENSE

MCO 9: page 86
A. Shapiro
D. Botsch

1. P-K4 P-QB3
2. P-QB4 N-KB3
3. P-Q4 P-Q4
4. N-QB3 B-B4?
5. PxP PXP

Black makes his first mistake. At Stockholm, 1961, 5. ........, P-K3; 6. N-B3, BK2 was played six times. And 5. ........, N-B3; 6. B-N5, P-K3; 7. P-B5, B-K2; 8. B-N5, 0-O; 9. N-B3, N-K5 is sound.
6. B-N5
P-K3
7. P-B5
P-QN3?

This second mistake loses. Either 7. ........, B-K2 or 7. ........, N-B3 should be played.

## 8. B-N5ch K-K2

If 8. ........, QN-Q2?; 9. P-B6, QN-N1?; 10. P-B7ch wins the Queen.

```
9. N-B3 PxP 11. O-O P-QR3
10. PxP Q-R4 12. NxPch!!
```



After 12. NxPchH
With the KB hanging, White sacrifices a piece and launches a mating attack.
12.

PxN
On 12. ........, K-Q1; 13. NxNch or 13. NN6ch wins.

> 13. R-K1ch B-K3

If 13. ......... K-Q1; 14. QxPch wins.
14. QxP!

Two pins are exploited. Threat: 15: QQ6 mate.

> 14. ........ PxB

Threatening 16. NxB, PxN; 17. RxPch, K-B2; 18. RxNch, K-K1; 19. Q-B7ch, KQ1; 20. R-B6ch, B-K2; 21. QxB mate. But 15. Q-N7ch! is surer: for example 15. ........, N-Q2 (15. ........, K-K1; 16. PB6, Q-R2; 17. Q-B8ch, K-K2; 18. QRQ1, N-R3; 19. R-Q7ch, QxR; 20. QxQ mate!) 16. QR-Q1! R-Q1; 17. P-B6, K-K1; 18. PxNch, RxP; 19. RxR, and White wins.
15.
R-R3
16. QR-Q1!?

And here again 16. Q-N7ch is surer. But the text-move menaces 17 . N-B5ch, K-K1; 18. Q-N7 and wins.

> 16. ........ P-N5?

The only hope of contriving a defense is 16 .
........, Q-B2!
17. Q-N7ch K-K1

If 17. ........, N-Q2; 18. NxB! kills.
18. QxNch Q-Q1

If 18. ........, K-Q2 (18, ........, K-K2; 19. N-B5 mate); 19. N-N3ch wins.
19. QxQch

Black forces a won ending. A quick finish would be 19. NxB, QxQ; 20. N-B7 mate!
19. ....... $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{Q}$ 21. R-Q8ch K-N2 20. NxBch K-B1 22. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B} \quad \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ Or 22. ........, RxR; 23. NxR, RxP; 24. $\mathrm{BxN}, \mathrm{PxB}$; 25. R-QB1, and White wins.

| 23. R×R | PxN |
| :--- | :--- |
| 24. P-KN3 | RxP |
| 25. RxKP | $\ldots . . .$. |

Threatening 26. BxN, PxB; 27. RxPch, K-B1; 28. R-K8 mate.


Clever combinative play by White!

## A KNIGHT SACRIFICE

Young Jeffrey Harris of Philadelphia forces mate with a Knight sacrifice.

## U. S. Amateur

Asbury Park, 1962
ALEKHINE DEFENSE
MCO 9: p. 81, c. 11, (b:B)
J. Harris (2072) C. Reinwald (2006)

1. P-K4 N-KB3 3. P-Q4 P-Q3
2. P-K5 N-Q4 4. N-KB3 B-B4?

This unusual move can hardly be recommended. Regular is 4. $\qquad$ B-N5.

## 5. N-R4

This is a more convincing refutation than the book's 5. B-Q3 and 5. B-K2.
5.

B-Q2
Preferable is 5 . $\qquad$ B-B1.
6. P-QB4
N-N3
8. PxP
P-K3 7. N-QB3 PxP 9. N-B3 B-B4 The Bishop is misplaced here. Better are 9. ........, N-B3 and 9. ........, B-K2.
10. B-Q3
11. 0.0

N-B3
N-N5
Black's congestion is afforded more relief with 11. ........, N-Q5. But if 11. ........., O-O? the old sacrifice 12 . BxPch wins, viz., 12. ........, KxB; 13. N-N5ch, K-N3; 14. Q-Q3ch, P-B4; 15. PxP e.p.ch.
12. B-K4
B-B3
13. Q-K2
0.0 ?

Castling into it. Safer is 13 . $\qquad$ 14. QxB, (14. NxB, B-K2; 15. R-Q1, QB1), Q-Q6! ; 15. QxNP, QxP.
14. R-Q1 Q-K1 16. NxB N-R3 15. P-QR3 BxB 17. KN-N5 B-K2? A stiffer defense is 17. ........, P-KB3! 18. PxP, PxP and the White Queen does not reach R5.
18. Q-R5 P-R3?

This loses: forced is 18. ........, BxN; 19. NxB, (or 19. BxB!) P-R3. 19. N-B6ch!


After 19. $\mathbf{N}$-B6chl
Decisive.
19.

PxN
If 19. ........ BxN; 20. PxB, PxN; 21. QxP, P-N3; 22. Q-R6 and 23. Q-N7 mate. 20. PxP

BxBP
Black must take the BP because 21. QxP and 22. Q-N7 mate, or 22. Q-R7 mate, was threatened.

| 21. QxP | BxN |
| :--- | ---: |
| 22. $Q \times B$ ch | K-R2 |
| 23. $R$-Q3 | Resigns |

24. R-R3 mate cannot be prevented.

## READING ACTIVITIES

The Reading (Penna.) Y.M.C.A. Chess Club beat the Kutztown State Teachers College $131 / 2-1 / 2$, and then dropped a pair of matches to Allentown, 10-1, and to Lancaster, $51 / 2-31 / 2$.

Winner of the club championship tournaments were, Expert - Forrest Schaeffer ( $61 / 2-11 / 2$ ); Class A-Frederick Townsend (9-1).

Michael Yatron played a simultaneous exhibition against the club's top 16 players, yielding only a single draw to James Matz.

## FORT LEWIS CHAMP

Gregory Kern, Combat Support Company, 12th Infantry, won the Fort Lewis Chess Championship by a score of $41 / 2-1 / 2$.

## EXCEPTION

More often than not, the way to refute a sacrifice is to accept it. Not so here.

## Gareway Open, 1961 SICILIAN DEFENSE

MCO 9: p. 155, c. 166, (a)
T. Garmon (1793)
P. Stark (1924)

1. P-K4
P-K3

This is a curious reply to the French, but transposition to a familiar setup is likely.

## 2. ........ P-QB4

Abandoning the French (2. ........, P-Q4), Black makes it a Sicilian.
3. P-B4

White is determined to avoid the beaten path (3. N-B3, N-QB3; 4. P-Q4, PxP; 5. NxP ).
3.
P-Q4
4. P-K5

Tschistakov-Chasin, 1957, continued: 4. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{PxP}$; 5. NxP, N-QB3; 6. B-N5, BQ2; 7. Q-K2, P-QR3; 8. BxN, BxB; 9. P-Q3, N-B3; 10. O-O, B-K2; 11. NxNch. BxN ; 12. B-K3, Q-Q4 with a slight advantage for Black.
4. ........ B-K2?

A jamming move. Logical are 4.
N-QB3 and 4. ........, N-K2.
5. N-B3
N-QB3
8. B-K3
6. B-N5
B-Q2
7. P-Q4
R-B1

Q-N3

This loses a vital center Pawn to an old tactical finesse. 9. PxP, BxP; 10. BxB, $\mathrm{QxB} ; 11 . \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2$ is feasible.

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
\text { 9. } \ldots \ldots . . & \text { NxKP! } \\
\text { 10. BPxN } & \ldots \ldots . . \\
\times B c h, \mathrm{NxB} . & \\
\text { 10. } \ldots \ldots . & \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B} \\
\text { 11. NxB } & \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{N} \\
\text { 12. N-N5 } & \ldots . . .
\end{array}
$$

If $10 . \mathrm{BxBch}, \mathrm{NxB}$.
12. Q-K1 (intending 13. Q-N3) is more promising.
12. ........

N-R3
Simpler is 12. ........, BxN; 13. BxB, N-K2.

> 13. Q-R5
0.0

Or 13. ........, BxN; 14. BxB, N-B4.
14. R-B6!?


A winning offer, if accepted. And probably a losing one if declined. But apparently White has nothing better, for if 14. R-B3 or 14. P-KN4 then Q-K7! and if $14 . \mathrm{NxKP}, \mathrm{PxN} ; 15 . \mathrm{BxN}, \mathrm{PxB} ; 16$. Q-N4ch, K-R1; 17. QxP, Q-K1.

> 14. ....... PxR??

The correct defense is 14 . ........, QxP! (sometimes take the QNP!); 15. QR-KB1, QxBP (bolstering the king-side and snatching another Pawn at the same time); 16. NxBP, (if 16. RxN?, PxR; 17. NxBP, Q-N3!), N-B4; 17. R/1xN, PxR(4); 18. N-N5, P-B5!

| 15. KPxP | BxP |
| :--- | ---: |
| 16. QxN | BxN |
| 17. QxBch | Resigns |

Forced is 17. ........ K-R1; 18. Q-B6ch, KN1; 19. B-R6, Q-B8ch (spite check); 20. RxQ, any 21. Q-N7 mate.

## MASTERLY

A masterly victory with systematic opening maneuvers and brilliant middle-game sacrifices.

## Greater Chicago Championship, 1962 <br> NIMZO-INDIAN DEFENSE

## MCO 9: p. 274, c. 49

E. Formanek (2136)
A. Mengelis (1954)

1. P-Q4
P-K3
2. N-QB3
B-N5
3. P-QB4 N-KB3
4. P-QR3

This is the Samisch Variation, but the Rubinstein is reached in two moves.


With a positional threat of 7. ........, B-R3.
7. PxP
PxP
8. B-Q3
B-N2

Not 8. ........, B-R3??; 9. BxB, NxB; 10. Q-R4ch, and White wins a piece.

| 9. N-K2 QN-Q2 | 11. P-B3! | P-B4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10. O-O $\quad 0.0$ | 12. N-N3 | ....... |  |
| Or | 12. P-N4 and then | 13. N-N3. |  |
|  | 12. ...... | R-K1 |  |
|  | 13. R-R2! | P-B5? |  |

It is a fundamental strategic error to relieve the pressure on Q5 in this line. More thoughtful are 13. ........, QR-B1 and 13. ........, N-B1.
14. B-NI
P.QN4

Black's Q-side counter-play is doomed to be too little and too late.

## 15. R-K2

15. Q-Q2 and 16. Q-KB2 is another promising preparation to P-K4.
16. 

........
P.QR4
16. P-K4!
........

This pawn-break is particularly effective when ........., P-B5 has been played. White secures a pawn-roller, either QP and KP or KP and KBP.

> 16........ PxP

Otherwise 17. P-K5, 18. P-B4, and 19. P-B5 follows. Even so this is probably better for Black than the exchange of Pawns which opens the KB file.
17. PxP R-R3

Preferable is 17. ........, N-B1; 18. P-K5, N/3-Q2.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 18. P-K5 } & \text { N-Q4 } \\
\text { 19. R/2-KB2 } & \text { P-B3 }
\end{array}
$$

The position is lost. If 19 . ........, R-B1 (19. ........, R-K2; 20. B-N5); 20. Q-R5, P-N3 (20. ......... P-R3; 21. N-B5); 21. Q-B3 (threatening 22. B-R6) and wins. Or if 19.
........, NxBP; 20. BxPch!, KxB; 21. Q-R5ch, K-N1 (21. ........, R-R3; 22. BxR, PxB; 23 RxPch, and mate in two); 22. QxPch, K-R1; 23. R-B5 and White wins.

If 21. ........, NxP; 22. NxP! still follows and if 21. ........, P-N3; 22. N-R6ch.
22. NxP !!


After 22. NxP!!
With so many positional advantages, a combination was bound to explode.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 22. } \ldots \ldots & \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{N} \\
\text { 23. PxPch } & \mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}
\end{array}
$$

If 23. ........, K-R1 (23. ........, RxP; 24. B-N5); 24. Q-N5! wins.
24. B-R6ch
K-R1

If 24. ........, K-N1; 25. Q-N5ch wins.
25. Q-B7!

Threatening 26. B-N7 mate.
25. ........ N-K3

If 25. ........, N-R4; 26. QxNch! and mate in two.

## 26. RxN

Threatening both 27. QxP mate and 27. RxN, BxR; 28. B-N7 mate.

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
\text { 26. ..... } & \text { R-R2 } \\
\text { 27. B-N7ch! } & \text { NxB } \\
\text { 28. Q-B8ch! } & \text { Resigns }
\end{array}
$$

For if 28. ........, RxQ; 29. RxRch, QxR; 30. RxQ mate. A fine finish to a fine game!

## QUEEN OFFERS

White discovers that only by sacrificing his own Queen can he hope to survive against that of his opponent.

## Baltimore Open, 1961

SANTASIERE'S FOLLY
MCO 9: p. 346 (a:B)
R. Miller (1750) Dr. G. Schreiber (1790)

1. N-KB3
P-Q4
2. P-QN4 N-QB3?

This is the wrong Knight.

| 3. | P-N5 | N-N1 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 4. | B-N2 | P-QR3 |
| 5. | PxP | ....... |

5. P-QR4 and 5. P-K3 deserve thought.
6. ....... NxP 7. P-B4 P-QB3
7. P-K3 B-N5 8. PxP QxP

Evidently Black did not want to lock in his QB with 8.
B-Q2; 10. Q-N3, P-K3.

9. | B-K2 | N-B3 | 12. QN-Q2 Q-KR4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 10. O-0 | P-K3 | 13. P-KR3?! |
| 11..... |  |  |
10. 0.0

P-K3
II. P-Q4

212

Is this winning a piece, or weakening the king-side!?
$\begin{array}{lr}\text { 13. } & \text { P..... } \\ \text { 14. } & \text { BxP } \\ \text { 15. } & \text { QxP } \\ \text { N } & \\ \text { P5I } & \end{array}$
16. R-KI
N-N5
15. N-K5! P-KR4!
17. N-B1
White must not open the KR file with 17. NxN ? or 17. BxN?
17. ........
0.0 .0
18. Q-R4
........

Threatening 19. $\operatorname{BxN}(6), \mathrm{PxB}$; 20. QxRP ch. If 18. NxKBP??, B-R7ch and mate in two.
18. $19 . .$.
N-B2
20. PxB
BxN

Black has a diabolical scheme in mind. However, 20. ........, NxP/K4, obtaining three Pawns for the piece, and 20. R-R3, intending 21.

R-N3, are probably stronger.

## 21. BxN??

This is just what Black wants! Correct is $21 . \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{KB} 4$ !

| 21. $\ldots$...... | PxB |
| :--- | ---: |
| 22. | N-N3 |$\quad$ R-Q7!

Threatening mate in two.

| 23. Q-KB4 | Q-R7ch |
| :--- | ---: |
| 24. K-B1 | N-Q4 |
| 25. $Q \times B P$ | $Q \times N!!$ |

This is the scheme: threat-26. ........., R-R8 mate.

> 26. QxKPch K-N1 27. Q-K8ch!!


After 27. Q-K8ch
And both Queens are in hock! Actually, a Queen sacrifice is the only way to defend against the threat of mates at KR8 and KB2.

27
K-R2??
Probably hypnotized by his double mate threats, Black misses an easy win, viz., 27. ........, RxQ!; 28. PxQ, R-R1!; 29. K-N1, R/7-R7!; 30. K-B1, N-B6! Or 29. R-K2, R-R8ch; 30. K-N2, NxPch!; 31. KxR, RxR.

## 28. B-B5ch N-N3??

And another easy win is 28. ........, P-N3. 29. BxNch $K \times B$ ??

And here 29. ........, K-R3!; 30. Q-R8ch, $R x Q ; 31 . P x Q, R-R 1$ at least draws.

## 30. QR-N1ch K-R2??

And Black could save half a point with 30. ........, K-R3!; 31. Q-R8ch, RxQ; 32. PxQ, R-R1.

## 31. RxPch!

But now the tables are turned and White has a forced draw.
31.
KxR
32. R-N1ch K-R2??

But this finally loses! With 32.
K-B2! it can still be drawn!
33. Q-K7ch Resigns

As the next move is $34 . \mathrm{Q}$-R3 mate. Far from being a perfect game, this one is full of imagination and excitement.

## RECOIL

Black's early Queen sortie recoils.

## County Championship

 Milwaukee, 1962NIMZOWITSCH ATTACK
MCO 9: p. 347, c. 33

## G. Nowak (1824) <br> C. Gardner (1865) <br> 1. N-KB3 <br> P-Q4

More elastic is 1. ........, N-KB3.
2. P-QN3

This is the Nimzowitsch Attack, a highly strategical opening, in some respects akin to the Bird.


If 9. ........, NxP?; 10. BxB, (10. NxN, BxB)
NxN; 11. BxR, NxNeh; 12. BxN, KxB
and Black does not have quite enough for the exchange.
10. P-B4
N-B4
11. Q-B2
B-R3?

A little indecision. Seemingly best is 11. ........, B-N5. But if 11. ........, N/3xP?; 12. BxB!, NxN; 13. QxN, KxB; 14. Q-Q4ch wins a piece.

| 12. O-O | B-N2 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 13. P-QN4 | N-K3 |
| 14. N-N3 |  |
| mediately 14. B-K5. |  |
| 14. .... | N-B5 |
| 15. B-K5 | NxBch |
| 16. QxN | Q-Q2 |

And the unfortunate sortie is begun. Possible is 16. ........, Q-N3; 17. P-QR3, B-N5.

## 17. QR-Q1 <br> Q-N5?

This is asking for it. Caution prompts 17. ........, Q-K1, as backward as it is.

## 18. R-Q4!

Threatening to win with $19 . \mathrm{BxN}, \mathrm{BxB}$; 20. P-K5, Q-K3; 21. N-B5.
18. ........

N-R4??
This loses by force. A try is 18. ........, Q-R4.

> 19. P-KR3 N-B5

If 19. ........, Q-K3; 20. N-B5 wins.

## 20. BxN <br> QxB

This drops the Queen. But playing a piece down with 20 . ........, Q-R4 is unpalatable.

If 21 21. P-K5 Q-B4 Q-R3; 22. R-R4 does it. 22. P-N4 Q-K3
23. N-B5!


After 23. N-B5!
A glaring example of the consequences of premature Queen excursions!
23.
24.

$\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{Q}$$\quad$| BxP |
| ---: |
| Resigns |

## LING, PETRISON TIE

Dick Ling and John Petrison, both 5-1, split the top spot of the Cincinnati Open, July 29. Tom Lajcik, leading a group of five bracketed at $41 / 2$, was not quite up to his performance of last September when he became co-champion of Ohio. Others sharing this spot were Tom Mazuchowski, Bill Wright (a promising junior), Allen Reinhard of Chicago, and Roger Underhill. Wright and Reinhard went undefeated.

## BENKO WINS IN N.Y.

Grandmaster Pal Benko of New York City, giving up one draw in the nineround event, won the new York State Chess Championship played at the I.B.M. Country Club in Poughkeepsie.

Second place in the 34-player field went to Angelo Sandrin of Chicago, who scored $61 / 2 \cdot 21 / 2$. Five players finished with $6-3$; in order of tie-break they were: Allen Kaufman, Paul Brandts, Mike Valvo, Dr. Ariel Mengarini and Harold Marks.

In a rapid transit tournament held after the main event, Mengarini and Peter Gould tied with scores of 4-2.

## KERES WINS MATCH

Paul Keres won his eight-game match with Ewfin Geller by a score of $41 / 2-31 / 2$ to officially finish in second place in the 1962 Candidates Tournament.

Keres and Geller finished in a tie for second and third at Curacao, each with $17-10$, and by winning the playoff Keres is now seeded to play in the next Candidates Tournament.

## COLLEGECHESS

by Peter Berlow

## 1962 NATIONAL INTERCOLLEGIATE TEAM EVENT

La Salle College, Philadelphia

## December 26-29

La Salle College is enthusiastically preparing for the National Intercollegiate Team Championship, announced last month in Chess Life. This will be the greatest collegiate event ever held, and you should be there.

For the first time in many years, specific eligibility rules are being announced. The event will be open to teams representing accredited colleges and universities. (A single college may send two or more teams, each paying a separate entry fee, and being treated as a single competitor. Both may compete for the same ICLA affiliate).

Every player must be a registered undergraduate student following a regular degree program. (Bring registration or I.D. cards with you to the tournament, since proof of status will be requested). Since no player may be eligible for over four years, no one who competed in a college chess event before January 1, 1959 may act as a team member.

Each team may appoint four regular players, plus two alternates. These must be arranged in order of strength, and this order must be followed throughout the event. (That is, the team may be arranged $1-2-3-4$, or $1-3-5-6$, etc. but not 2-1-3-4 or 1-2-6-4).

Arrangements will be the finest ever; this is La Salle's Centenary Year, and the sponsors will be doing their best to make this event a chess landmark. The attractions of Philadelphia are within easy access (and Friday evening, December 28, has been reserved for the Speed Championship, so that those players who prefer culture or entertainment to blitz chess can enjoy themselves). The annual ICLA membership meeting will be held Friday morning. Proxy ballots will be distributed in October, for those colleges unable to attend. Registration will be held from 6 to 7 p.m. on December 26th, with the last Round ending early Saturday evening.

For further information: watch Chess Life, or write to: Peter Berlow (Tournament Director), c/o Chemistry Department, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.

## ONTARIO CHAMP

G. Fuster became the Ontario Open Champion for $1962-3$ by winning the 28 player Swiss with a score of $5-0$. Katz, Patty and Theodorovitch finished 2, 3, 4 with a score of 4-1.
by DR. RICHARD S. CANTWELL


## In the United States

The City Terrace (L.A., Cal.) Expert's Invitational was won by Ben Kakimi with a score of $7-2$, and Sidney Weinbaum was second ( $61 / 2$ ). John Earnest and Jerry Hanken placed third and fourth (6). The round robin, played from May 9 to July 11 at the City Terrace Club, is well-annotated in a tournament book ( $\$ 1.50$ ) published by the club.

Adrian McAuley and Richard Baldock both posted 5-1 game scores in the New Orleans Chess Club Championship (May 4 June 15). The co-champions were followed in close order by Andrew Lockett and Lee Johnson.

The Michigan Chess Association simultaneously sponsored the 1962 Michigan Amateur and the 1962 Michigan Experts Tournaments this spring. In a good turnout of 43 players Loren Monroe of Detroit won the Amateur with $71 / 2$ points. Lynn Armour, Battlecreek, was second with 7. Third place went to Urban Lehner ( $51 / 2$ ) on Median points and Ken Evans was fourth. In the Experts department, Jack O'Keefe of Ann Arbor won it with 6 points, one tally over Don Napol of E. Lansing. J. Wasserman, K. Skema and R. Uhlmann (4 points each) placed third, fourth, and fifth on S.B. points. J. D. Brattin directed both events.
E. Book, with a 6.0 score, topped the Expert Candidate's Tournament sponsored by the Santa Monica Bay Chess Federation. Playing from May 7 through June 11, Book handily won over K. Pfeiffer and K. Stani ( $41 / 2$ points each). However, all three qualified for the S . California Expert Candidate Finals. (Usually the first six players in the finals attain expert ratings.)

Capturing the Raleigh (N.C.) Chess Championship for the third straight year, 18 year old David Steele beat out strong competition, including Jerry Fink, former Ohio Champion, who placed second, and former N.C. State Champion Dr. A. Jenkins who placed third. Jeff Blanchard won the junior prize.

Another third straight victory was marked by Texas master Kenneth R. Smith in the annual Southern Chess Championship held in Memphis, Tenn. The Dallas ace ripped off six wins and was held to a draw only in Round 3 by runner-up Joel Chalifoux of the U. of Florida.

Because of the title restriction, Chalifoux was named U.S.C.F. Region IV Champ.

In the team matches, held concurrently, with the tournament, the U. of Florida won the College Title by a record margin. Bob Eastwood directed the entire program.

One of the largest Swiss tournaments ever to be held in Colorado was the Second Annual Denver Chess League Open. Robert Walker (the Denver Open champ) topped the field of fifty-four with a perfect 6-0. After that it was strictly median. CEarles Musgrove was second with $5-1,15$ median; Monty Mirhosseini was third with $5-1,141 / 2$ median; and Richard Moore was fourth with $5-1,11$ median. The event was co-sponsored by the Denver Chess League and the Colorado State Chess Association.

At the same time that the 2nd Annual Denver Open was taking place, the 2nd Annual Hamilton AFB (Calif.) Open, coincidentally, was duplicating the Denver results. Top place went to William Addison with a perfect 6-0. After that it was all solkolf. Rex Wilcox was second with 5-1, 191/2 solkolf; W. C. Haines was third with 5-1, 19 solkolf; and Robert Henry was fourth with 5-1, 16 solkolf. The 35 player event was sponsored by the AFB Chess Club.

Rea Hayes, with a score of $5-1$, won the Union Central Championship ahead of Marshall Alexander (4-2), Roger Clark (4-2) and Ed Dougherty (3-3). Rea has the distinction of winning this tournament every time he has competed.

Gary Sperling, U.S.C.F. Rating Statistician, won the Marshall C.C. Jr. "A" Championship with a score of 5-2. Sandy Zabell was second ( $41 / 2$ ) and Kenneth Beirne, third ( 4 pts.). Gary, a precocious youth, is proud of the fact that he dropped the first two games and took the next five in a row for the title. If he wins his next tournament dramatically, life won't be worth living around the office.

Winning four games and drawing only one, Robert Walker became the 1962 Denver Open Champion. John Rinaldo (4-1) placed second on median points; Charles Mendoza (4-1), third; and Dennis Naylin (4-1), fourth. Robert Shean directed the 25 player event.

In a 48 player tournament concluded July 29, Ray Wenzel of Skokie, Ill. ( $41 / 2-1 / 2$ ), outscored the field in the 1962 Arkansas Annual Open. Kenneth Smith, winner of the Southern Chess Championship, was second (4-1) on tie-breaking points. Following, all with 41, were: Dick Schultz, New Orleans; Mark Preisman, Dallas; Larry Hill, Okla. City; and Geo. Lecompte, New Orleans. "Uncle Bob" Scrivener missed this one; the first since the founding of the Arkansas Chess Federation. In absentia, he was awarded an honorary plaque, for devotion to the Game, commemorating his eightieth birthday.

Kenneth Smith (again?) won the Crescent City Special (New Orleans) with a $4-1$ score. He was followed by Adrian McAuley, Dick Schultz, Steve Buining and James Lewark, all with $31 / 2-11 / 2$. Al Levitt, directing, used the median to break the ties.

The Los Alamos Round Robin Tournament, completed on July 10, resulted in a three way tie for first place in Section \#1. Donald Dodder, Mark Wells and William Kirk all compiled 4-2 scores. Section \#2 was won by Vernon Zeigner (5-1). Second and third place honors were shared by James Coulter and Paul Craig, both with 4-2. Sidney Brower directed.

Led by U.S.C.F. Master Paul Robey, the Kings County (N.Y.) Chess Club defeated the Kingsmen Chess Club by a score of 5.3 . In addition to Robey's, wins were notched for King's County by Perry Miller, Gordon Hutchins, Oliver Leeds and Minna Ebner. Hamilton Robinson, Jack Williams and Matthew LeGrand secured the Kingsmen's three points.

Walt Grombacher took top honors in the Spring Swiss Tourney of Gompers Park (III.) C.C. with 6-1, losing only to Dick Guetl. Tied for second were Jim Warren and Gerhardt Bierlich with 5-2.

With a perfect 7.0 score, James McCormick became the 1962 Oregon Champion. John Bell ( $51 / 2-1 \frac{1}{2}$ ) was runner-up and Donald Turner was third with 5-2. Sponsored by the Portland Chess Club, play was held at Reed College, Portland, Oregon.

Winner of the Carolinas Open was Vernon Robinson (5-1), followed by Norman Hornstein ( $41 / 2-11 / 2$ ) and Max Burkett (4-2). The event was sponsored by both the North and South Carolina Chess Associations; Mr. Grady Brown, directing.

Stan Tomchin (5-0) won the Susquehanna Valley Open July 29, in a 33 player Swiss Tournament sponsored by the Bloomsburg Chess Club (Penna.) Larry Snyder, Anthony Renna and Ernst Perkuhn each tallied four points, finishing in the order named on median. Mordecai Treblow directed.

The S. California Expert Candidates' Final was won by D. M. Sarley and K. Stani, both with $81 / 2-11 / 2$. E. Book, R. Myhro and K. Pfeiffer tied for third with $8-2$. This tournament is actually a continuation of the Expert preliminaries. For example, E. Book who won the Experts Candidates Tournament of Santa Monica (see above) with a score of 6-0, had a $2-2$ tally in this, the final. Thus he finishes with an 8-2 total. The S. California Chess League sponsored the affair; Gordon Barrett directed.

## TOURNAMENT LIFE

Sept. 21, 22, 28, 29
BOX ELDER

## COUNTY TOURNAMENT

6 -Round Swiss Open, sponsored by the Thiokol Chess Club, will be played at the Thiokol Training Building, 13 W . Forrest St., Brigham City, Utah. Entry fee: $\$ 3$; cash prizes. Address inquiries to Dave Sparkman, Mail Stop \#260, Thiokol Chemical Corp., Brigham City, Utah. <br> \section*{tept. 22-23 <br> \section*{tept. 22-23 <br> QUAKER CITY OPEN}

Sponsored by the Philadelphia Chess Assn., a 5 -Round Swiss will be held at La Salle College, 20th \& Olney Ave., Phila., Penna. Entry fees will be $\$ 5.00$ regular, $\$ 3.00$ junior. Cash prizes according to entries plus a special handicap prize. Address inquiries to $\mathrm{Mr}, \mathrm{H}$. Morris, 3480 Emerald St., Phila. 34, Penna. Please bring clocks, sets and boards. Entries close 9:30 A.M.

## Sept. 21 thru Nov. 30 <br> NEW ORLEANS <br> CITY CHAMPIONSHIP

The New Orleans Chess Club, Y.W. C.A. Bldg., 929 Gravier St., New Orleans, La. will conduct both a 10 -Round Swiss Open and a 10 -Round Swiss Reserve (under 1799 U.S.C.F. rating), both time limits being $45 / 2$.

Entry fee on the championship: \$4; under $18, \$ 2.50$. Trophies will be awarded and the championship is restricted to residency. Entry fee on the Reserve is $\$ 3$; Jr. \$2. Trophies \& mdse. will be awarded. Address inquiries to the New Orleans C.C.

## 1962 PENNSYLVANIA 30-30 OPEN

The Greater Reading C.C. is sponsoring a 6 -Round $30-30$ Swiss to be held at the Central Y.M.C.A., Reed \& Wash. St., Reading. The entry fee is $\$ 2$ and prizes will be $100 \%$ of net. State title is restricted to residency. Advance entries to Frederick S. Townsend, $103 \mathrm{Hal}-$ sey Ave., West Lawn, Penna.

Sept. 29 \& 30
CHAMPLAIN VALLEY OPEN
4 Round Swiss, $50 / 2$, will be held by the Plattsburgh Chess Club at the Y.M. C.A., 13 Oak St., Plattsburgh, N.Y. Entry fee: $\$ 2.50$; cash and trophy prizes. For additional information, write the director, John N. Otis, 130 Oak St., Plattsburgh, N.Y.

## Sept. 29 \& 30 <br> ROCKFORD OPEN

5-Round Swiss, 45 moves $/ 2 \mathrm{hrs}$., will be sponsored by the Rockford C.C. and played at the Rockford Y.M.C.A., 200 "Y" Blvd., Rockford, IIl. Entry fee, \$6; under 18 yrs., \$4. Registration: 8:3010:00 A.M. Write 1 week in advance for Y.M.C.A. reservations (@ \$3.75). Cash prizes. Address inquiries to Larry Mason, 404 Hill St., Rockford, III.

## Sept. 29-30 <br> FALLS CITY OPEN

5-Round Swiss (first round 9:00 A.M.) will be held at the Louisville Chess Club, 3rd. \& Broadway, Louisville, Ky. under the direction of Herb Fowler. U.S.C.F. entry fee- $\$ 5.00$. Prizes: 1st.$\$ 40$., 2nd.- $\$ 20$., Unrated- $\$ 10$.

## Oct. 5-6-7

CENTRAL FLORIDA OPEN
The Florida Chess Association will hold a 5 -Round Swiss to the Orlando C.C., Sunshine Park (opposite the City Auditorium), Orlando, Fla. Entry Fee to U.S.C.F. members: $\$ 6.00 ; \$ 4.00$ to students; plus $\$ 2.00$ F.C.A. dues. Cash prizes, trophies etc. Advance entries and inquiries: Charles Stallings, 114 Granada Ct., OrIando, Fla.

## Oct. 6 \& 7

## 6TH ANNUAL VERMONT OPEN

6 -Round Swiss, 40 moves $/ 3 \mathrm{hrs}$., will be held at the Havenwood School, Watkins Ave., Rutland, Vt., starting 10 A.M. Entry fee: $\$ 4.00$; students, $\$ 2.00$. Prizes for Class A, B \& Jr. For additional information, write: Fred Tatro, Town Line Road, Rutland, Vt.

## Oct. $6 \& 7$

INDIANA OPEN
The Indiana State Chess Association is sponsoring the 5 -Round Swiss, 60 moves/2 hrs., at the Central Y.M.C.A., 310 N . Illinois St., Indianapolis, Ind., registration-9 A.M. Entry fee: $\$ 4.00$; Jrs. $\$ 2.00$. Cash prizes. For inquiries: Edward R. Sweetman, 3055 N. Meridian St., \#4A, Indianapolis, Indiana.

## Oct. 11-14 <br> MASSACHUSETTS STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

Sponsored by the Boylston Chess Club and the Mass. State Chess Association, a 7 -Round Swiss will be played at the Boylston Y.M.C.U., Boylston St., Boston, Mass. The highest scoring resident will be the Mass. State Champion. First prize $-\$ 100.00$. Others according to entry in each class plus handicap prizes. M.S.C.A. dues of $\$ 2.00$ required of Mass. residents. An experimental entry fee is scheduled by Robert B. Goodspeed, tournament director; fees according to class with a pre-dated discount. Entry fee (prior to Oct. 10) Class A- $\$ 8.50$; B- $\$ 5 . ; \mathrm{C}-\$ 3$.; Unrated- $\$ 5$.; Juniors ( 18 yrs .) $\$ 1.00$ less. After Oct. 10, A- $\$ 10 . ; \mathrm{B}-\$ 6 . ; \mathrm{C}-\$ 4$.; Unrated-\$6.; Juniors $\$ 1.00$ less. Registration closes 7:30 P.M. Address entries and inquiries to R. B. Goodspeed, 245 Park Street, Stroughton, Mass. Players are requested to bring sets and clocks.

## Oct. 12-13-14 ROCKET CITY OPEN

5 -Round Swiss at the Sahara Motor Inn, Memorial Parkway So., Huntsville, Ala. Entry fee: $\$ 5$ plus U.S.C.F. membership. Prizes $\$ 50-1$ st; $\$ 25$-handicap; others. Early registration 6 P.M. Oct. 12. Contact Ken Williamson, Huntsville Chess Club, 4102 Pine Ave., Huntsville, Ala.

Oct. 13 \& 14
3rd. ANNUAL GATEWAY OPEN
A $\$ 100.00$ first prize is guaranteed by the Pittsburgh Chess Club in the 5 Round Swiss to be held at the PennSheraton Hotel, Wm. Penn Plaza, Pittsburgh, Penna. Entry fee: $\$ 6.50 ; \$ 2.50$, Jrs. under 18. Advance entries: William Byland 1610 Bigelow Apts., Pgh. 19, Penna.

## Oct. 13 to 20

## 1962 ARMED FORCES CHESS TOURNAMENT

General David M. Shoup, Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, will head a Honorary Committee of Flag Officers for the 1962 Thomas Emery Armed Forces Chess Finalists' Tournament to be held at the USO Club in Lafayette Square, Wash., D.C. Three representatives will be selected from each of the services-Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps-to compete for the Thomas Emery Trophy. Last year's winners were: Capt. John A. Hudson, USCF; Airman $2 / \mathrm{C}$ Gilbert Ramirez, USAF; Specialist 4/C Arthur W. Fuerstein, USA, and PFC. Arthur D. Wang, USA.

## Oct. 17 to Nov. 28 <br> LAS VEGAS <br> CITY-WIDE CHAMPIONSHIP

Restricted to area residents of Clark County, a 7 -Round Swiss will be held at the Dula Recreation Center, 430 East Bonanza Rd., Las Vegas, Nevada. Entry fee to U.S.C.F. members $\$ 5.00$. Cash prizes and trophies. Sponsored by the Las Vegas C.C., address entries to H. Estrada, P.O. Box 2534 Huntridge Sta., Las Vegas, Nevada.

## Oct. 19-20-21 <br> THE MIDWESTERN OPEN

The Lincoln Chess Club is sponsoring the Nebraska State Championship at the Lincoln Air Force Base Service Club, Lincoln, Nebraska, the title being restricted to residents. A 6 -Round Swiss Open, starting at 2 P.M., entry fee is $\$ 5.00$. Minimum first prize- $\$ 50.00$; others according to entries. For advance entries and inquiries, write: Amton Sildmets, 6921 "W" St., Lincoln, Nebr.

Ocf, 19-20-21
BALTIMORE OPEN
Sponsored by the Maryland Chess Association, a 6 -Round Swiss, (50/2), will be held at the Towson Y.M.C.A., Baltimore, Maryland. Entry fee: $\$ 5.00$; Jrs. under 21, $\$ 3.00$. First prize- $\$ 50.00$. Cash awards for 2nd, 3rd. Trophies for A, B, C, Jr., Unrated and Woman's. For further information, write the director, William C. Koenig, 810 Braeside Rd., Baltimore, Md.

## Oct. 20 \& 21 <br> LAKE ERIE OPEN

5 -Round Swiss, $50 / 2$ hrs., will be held at the Hotel Buffalo, Wash. \& Swan Sts., Buffalo, N.Y. under the sponsorship of the Queen City Chess Club. Entry fee: $\$ 5.00$. Guaranteed first prize $\$ 100$; others according to entries. For further information, contact Ralph J. Nasca, 111 Whitney Pl., Buffalo, N.Y.

## Oct. 20, 21, 27, 28 <br> ILLINOIS OPEN

8 -Round Swiss, sponsored by both the Illinois Chess Association and Gompers Park C.C., will be held at Gompers Park, starting 11:00 A.M. Oct. 20. Entry fee: $\$ 10 ; \$ 5$ for Jrs. Time control: $45 / 2$; please bring clocks, sets and U.S.C.F. membership cards. Minimum first prize $-\$ 100$. Prizes for 2 nd-4th, (2) class A, (2) class B, class C, Junior \& Unrated. For advance entries: Illinois Chess Association, c/o Mrs. Eva Aronson, 4058 Oketo Ave., Chicago.

## Oct. 26-27-28 <br> NURNBERG OPEN <br> (1)th USCF European Rating Tournament)

6-Round Swiss at U.S. Army Transient Hotel, Nurnberg, Germany. Open to all USCF Members. \$3.50 entry fee-cash prizes depend upon number of entries. For information write (Air Mail) to Tournament Director, Capt. Arthur C. Joy, Hq., 17th Signal Bn., APO 164, New York, N.Y.

## Oct. 27-28

## SACRAMENTO OPEN II

5-Round Swiss, USCF rated, $\$ 150$ prize fund with trophies for 1st and Classes A, B, C. Entry fee $\$ 5.00$ till Oct. 22, $\$ 6.00$ thereafter. To be held at Sacramento YWCA, 17th and L St., Sacramento, Calif. Entries \& inquiries to: William L. Rebold, 2681 Fairfield St., Apt. 5, Sacramento 15, Calif.

> Tournament organizers wishing announcement of USCF rated events should make application at least six weeks before the publication date of CHESS LIFE. Special forms for requesting such announcements may be obtained only from U.S. Chess Federation, 80 E. IIth St., New York 3 , N.Y.

## SHOREMEN OPEN

5 -Round Swiss to be played at Public Library, 32649 Electric Blvd., Avon Lake, Ohio. $40 \%$ of income to section I winner; $\$ 35$ minimum for 1 st in other sections. An experimental pairing and tie-breaking system will be used. $\$ 5$ USCF dues accepted with entry fee (EF $\$ 5$ till Oct. 25 ; then $\$ 7$ ). Details: L. L. Wilson, 780 Tarry Lane, Amherst, Ohio.

$$
\text { Nov. 3, 4, 10, } 11
$$

## NORTH CALIFORNIA OPEN

8 -Round Swiss, the first four rounds will be played at the Hamilton AFB Service Club (Nov. 3 \& 4) and the second four at the Mechanics Institute Chess Club, 57 Post St., San Francisco, Calif. Final registration-10 A.M. at the AFB. Entry fee: $\$ 9.40$ and U.S.C.F. \& C.S.C.F. membership. Winner and run-ner-up will be seeded into the Calif. Closed Championship, Thanksgiving weekend, fees paid. Other cash prizes: 3rd-5th, A, B, C, Jr. Please bring clocks and sets. For inquiries and schedule, write: A/2c Chas. R. Savery, HQ 28 Air Division, Box 779, Hamilton AFB, Calif.

## Nov. 7 thru 10 <br> UTAH STATE OPEN

7-Round Swiss will be held at the Y.M.C.A. Chess Club, 39 Exchange Pl., Salt Lake City. Registration 7 P.M., Nov. 7. Victory banquet on Sat. eve.; tours and recitals available. Entry fee: \$7; handicap awards along with regular trophies and cash prizes. Address inquiries to C.C. McDaniels, 2970 Highland Dr., Salt Lake City, Utah.

## SOLUTION TO QUIZ QUARTET: (1)

1. P-B5 Resigns if ........, K-R; 2. PxNP, BPxP; 3. NxP + etc.
(2)
2. Q-N5 +, Resigned. There is a simple fork in the position on K-R; 2. Q-K7 wins.
(3)
3. Q-N5, P-N3; 2. N-K7+, K-N2; 3. R×N!, BxR; 4. Q-B6+, K-R3; 5. R-B5!, Q-R2+; 6. K-B, Resigns.
(4)
[^0]
## A GUIDE TO CHESS OPENINGS, <br> Leonard Barden

Shows how the average player, with little time to devote to study, can improve his opening play by specializing in a few openings suited to his individual style. Diagrams. 238 pp.

List Price $\$ 4.75$ Members $\$ 3.99$

## HOW GOOD IS YOUR CHESS? <br> Leonard Barden

Test and grade yourself by playing along. side and against well-known masters. 112 pp. Diagrams.

List Price $\$ 3.75$ Members $\$ 3.19$
THE FIRESIDE BOOK OF CHESS, Irving Chernev and Fred Reinfeld Stories, sketches, cartoons, oddities, a chess quiz, 50 combinations, 47 endgame novelties, 31 problems, 184 remarkable games-all combine to make one of the most attractive chess books ever published. An ideal gift for a chess-playing friend. 338 diagrams. 400 pp .

List Price $\$ 5.95$ Members $\$ 5.06$

## PRACTICAL CHESS ENDINGS,

 Irving ChernevA basic guide to endgame strategy for the beginner and the more advanced chess player. 300 diagrams. 319 pp.

List Price $\$ 5.95$ Members $\$ 5.06$

## BASIC CHESS ENDINGS, <br> Reuben Fine

What MCO is to the Opening, this work is to the endgame-the authoritative work in English. 607 diagrams. 573 pp.

List Price $\$ 7.50$ Members $\$ 5.93$
CHESS HANDBOOK OF 360 BRIL. LIANT AND INSTRUCTIVE END GAMES, A. A. Troitzky
360 of the finest end-game compositions by one of the great composers. Diagrams. 192 pp .

List Price $\$ 3.95$ Members $\$ 3.56$
EMANUEL LASKER: THE LIFE OF A CHESS MASTER, by J. Hannak with a foreword by Albert Einstein
A biography of one of the greatest players in chess history, together with 101 of his best games annotated by many authoritles, including Tarrasch, Marco, Reti, and Lasker himself. 320 pp .

List Price $\$ 4.95$ Members $\$ 4.20$

## MANUEL OF CHESS,

## Emanuel Lasker

A reprint of one of the great chess classies, which only a short time ago was among the rare items that chessplayers searched for in the second-hand bookshops. 308 diagrams. 379 pp .

Paperbound $\$ 2.00$

## ORDER FROM

## U. S. Chess federation

80 E. 11th St.
N.Y. 3, N.Y.


[^0]:    Black played 1. ........, R-Q3! and White resigned for if 2. N-N4, RKN3! wins.

