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## \$650 TO GO!

"Buy now and pay later," seems to be the motto of the American teams in international competition. Through the efforts of the Federation, ACF, the Lamport Foundation, the Piatagorsky Foundation, and the State Dept. we were able to put the Varna show on the road. Because of the generosity of the Federation members, we were able to cover $\$ 1200.00$ of the team's expenses while they were in Europe. We still have a $\$ 650$ deficit to meet. "Buy now and pay later" has been a necessity in American Chess so far. When a tournament invitation arrives there isn't very much time to raise the money in advance. The team should go. To decline an important tournament would put us all in a bad light, not only from the standpoint of American prestige but also from the position that we have one of the strongest teams in the world, backed up by very promising up-and-coming players. If we forego international tournaments, the caliber of American chess can only decline. So we scurry about trying to raise the necessary funds, but in the end, we rely on the members to partially support the team effort. The membership goal of $\$ 2000$ didn't seem so much then. The $\$ 650$ doesn't seem so much now. We had a team effort in Varna. Let's have a team effort from the membership.
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Address all communications, and make all checks payable to:
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## FISCHER WINS U.S. TITLE FOR FIFTH TIME

## Bisguier Second; Three Tie for Third

Robert J. ("Bobby") Fischer won the United States chess championship for the fifth time on January 3, 1963, by defeating grandmaster Arthur Bisguier in a dramatic last-round battle. A capacity audience in New York's Henry Hudson Hotel broke into loud applause as the two players, champion and runnerup, shook hands after Bisguier's resig. nation. Both players were smiling; Fischer obviously happy and relieved, Bisguier apparently undismayed by what must have been one of the bitterest disappointments of his chess career.

For it was Bisguier, playing probably the steadiest chess of any of the contestants, who led the field throughout most of the tournament. Undefeated going into the final round, he was tied with Fischer for first place at 7-3. Playing black, he countered Fischer's Ruy Lopez with the ancient Berlin Defense, against which Bobby made little headway. If anything, black seemed to have a slight advantage in the early middle game. But then, on his twenty-third move, Bisguier made his one really bad slip of the tournament. Retreating his bishop to queen one, he gave Fischer the opportunity for a tactical maneuver that enabled him to anchor a white knight firmly on queen six. Black's game rapidly became untenable and Fischer pushed home his advantage with relentless accuracy. Rather than prolong the contest into a hopeless (and anticlimactic) adjournment session, Bisguier resigned on his thirtyseventh move and Bobby Fischer was again U. S. chess champion.

## "Even the Americans"

Fischer's winning score of $8-3$ included a first-round defeat at the hands of Edmar Mednis, as reported in our December issue. This setback was Bobby's first loss in an American tournament since 1957. It was clearly the result of a bad habit that Fischer developed at Curacao, if not earlier: he tried too hard to force a win in a position that held no real winning chances. After this initial slip, Fischer played steadily-..though by no means faultlessly-and improved his standing almost round by round. His final score showed six wins, one loss, and four draws.

Bobby's victory was well deserved and a tribute to his great energy and fighting spirit. It cannot be said that anyone in the tournament played better chess. At the same time, a number of qualified observers believe that Bobby himself played better chess not so many months ago and that his play since his great

Interzonal victory in Stockholm has shown several flaws. It isn't likely, though, that many will agree with the spectator at the tournament who announced loudly that Fischer is all washed up. "He's a has-been!" he said loudly. "Even the Americans are starting to beat him!"

## Three for the Interzonal

Bisguier's loss to Fischer was his only defeat of the tournament and he finished a clear second, with four wins and six draws to his credit. Since this year's championship is also the Zonal Tournament, both Fischer and Bisguier have


Robert J. Fischer
qualified for next year's Interzonal. The third qualifier from F.I.D.E. Zone 5 will be chosen by a play-off among William Addison, Larry Evans, and Samuel Reshevsky, all of whom scored $61 / 2$ points in tying for third through fifth. It is probable that the playoff will be held
in Los Angeles, where Addison now lives, some time in late February.

## A "New" Face

Fischer, Bisguier, Reshevsky and Evans are names known to anyone who follows American chess. Not so well known is William G. Addison, who played in his first U. S. Championship and celebrated the fact by defeating Reshevsky in the opening round. He now has a chance to be the third American representative in the next Interzonal.

Addison was born in Baton Rouge, La. in 1933. He learned to play chess when he was about twelve years old, joined a local club, and within a year was the strongest player in his city. He lived in San Francisco for about ten years and developed rapidly as a player, winning his master's title at the U. S. Open in Long Beach. By the time of the '58 Open in Cleveland his rating was up to 2300. In that event, he helped Bobby Fischer to win the U. S. Open title by defeating Arthur Bisguier. Oddly enough, he won the California championship for the first time last year, after finishing second and third in that event many times. Addison spent about a year in New York City in 1959-60 and set a record at the Manhattan Chess Club by winning twelve of their rapid transit tournaments in a row!

Bill's impression of his first U. S. Championship: "The play was surprisingly spotty. Everyone in the tournament was capable of playing much bet-ter-Reshevsky especially. On the whole, I think that Bisguier displayed the best form. My best game was against Mednis in round eight."

## Byrne the Invincible

Sixth place in this year's championship went to Robert Byrne, who scored $6-5$. The way in which that score was compiled is rather interesting: Bob won one game (against Rossolimo in Round One) and drew ten! He was the only undefeated player in the tournament. Byrne was also undefeated in the 1961 .

## UNITED STATES CHESS CHAMPIONSHIP 1962-1963

62 Championship, in which he was run-ner-up to Larry Evans. His combined score for the last two U. S. Championships is 4 wins and 18 draws. The fig. ures are deceptive, though, since many of Byrne's games are intricate and difficult struggles, far removed from the ordinary conception of the "grandmaster draw."

## What Happened?

The two biggest disappointments of this year's championship were undoubtedly Pal Benko ( $41 / 2-61 / 2$ ) and James Sherwin ( $21 / 2 \cdot 81 / 2$ ). Benko's performances have shown a definite falling-off since his splendid showing at Curacao and the explanation may possibly be put into three words: "Too much chess." Also, his time-pressure problem seems almost as bad as ever. At the start of the tournament he was hampered by a cold; he did well in the early rounds but was, by his own admission, "lucky" and not in good form. He never quite managed to get started and fell off badly during the second half of the tournament.

Sherwin's poor result, though unexpected, is not likely to be the symptom of anything serious. He got off to a wobbly start and began playing with an aggressiveness that bordered on the reckless. There is no doubt that he lost a number of games that he might easily have drawn if he had been content to take the half point. Jimmy's career has shown a number of setbacks in the past: for example the U. S. Seeded Championship in 1959, where he also finished last, without winning a game. It seems that Sherwin, who began playing serious chess rather "late" in life (i.e., in high school) suffers more than some of the other players from the psychological after-effects of defeat and is likely to go into a slump after a poor start. $\mathrm{He}^{\circ}$ s always come bouncing back in the
past, however, and there's no reason to think that he won't be a serious contender for the U. S. title in '63-'64.

## Rossolimo and Steinmeyer

Two welcome additions to the tournament were Nicolas Rossolimo and Robert Steinmeyer, though neither played up to his capacity. Rossolimo, without serious practice for many years, was obviously rusty at the start and was so disappointed with his showing that he wanted to withdraw from the tournament after blundering in the fourth round against Bisguier. Fortunately, he was prevailed upon to continue and went through the rest of the tournament without losing a game! His fine finish against Benko in round eight received a loud ovation, and his attempt for a brilliancy against Sherwin in the final round came within an inch of success.

Steinmeyer, who like Mednis and Sherwin was handicapped by having to put in a day at the office before playing his evening rounds, was by no means outclassed. Now a New York City resident, he may find time for more practice against top-flight opposition.

This year's U. S. Championship was remarkably strong. Of the top ten players on the USCF rating list, only William Lombardy and Donald Byrne were missing. All the players, with the exception of Berliner, were rated above 2400 (senior master) and Hans was as close as you can get--2399! It seems safe to say that his strong showing in this event will put him into the senior master class with something to spare.

The tournament was again conducted as a cooperative venture by the $U$. S. Chess Federation and the American Chess Foundation. The championship


BEFORE THE START. Reshevsky and Addison chatting before the start of their first-round game.
committee, under the chairmanship of M. J. Kasper, consisted of David Hoffmann, I. A. Horowitz, and J. F. Reinhardt. The staging and management of the tournament were under USCF direction, and had the valuable assistance of Mr. Morris Steinberg of the Manhattan Chess Club.

Fischer, by winning, will again have his name engraved on the Frank J. Marshall Trophy and will receive a formal presentation at the Marshall Chess Club.

## HERMANN HELMS

The man who was known for almost a quarter of a century as "The Dean of American Chess" died in Brooklyn, N.Y. on January 6 , at the age of ninety-three.

That trite obituary phrase, "his passing marks the end of an era," surprises one, in the case of Hermann Helms, by having the ring of simple truth. Already in the early 1890's he was a player of master strength in the then-powerful Brooklyn Chess Club. This was before Brooklyn became a borough of Greater New York, before Harry Nelson Pillsbury became the hero of Hastings, and before Dr. Emanuel Lasker became either a world champion or a doctor of philosophy. The chess career of Hermann Helms reached from Steinitz to Bobby Fischer.

Almost from the start, it was a career devoted more to chess journalism than to tournament competition. Though he retained his playing strength to a remarkable degree, and played some sprightly games when he was well into his eighties, it was in the field of journalism that Hermann Helms made his great contributions to American chess. As a columnist for the Brooklyn Eagle, as chess editor of the N.Y. Times, and as editor and publisher of the American Chess Bulletin, he provided, almost single-handed, a chronicle of the American chess scene for the first three decades of this century. The American Chess Bulletin, founded in 1904the year of the great Cambridge Springs Tournament-is still being published, and one hopes that some way will be found to keep it going as a valuable part of America's chess tradition.

Hermann Helms was a hard and dedicated worker. Nothing but death could have put an end to his labors. He built well, and there is little that is good on the American chess scene today that is not, in some degree, his memorial.


Black commits the cardinal error of starting an attack before all his pieces are developed. His own King, consigned to the center, eventually becomes the victim of a dazzling counterattack. Even so, White must have steady nerves to tempt the attack at a time when no clear refutation was in sight. And Sherwin must be given great credit for injecting complications against his better judgment. The explanation for these sharp tactics is that the game was played in round two after we had both scored juicy goose eggs at the outset. Owing to the metaphysics of the point scoring system, when both players are determined to come from behind fate may favor only one. A draw would have done neither of us any good.

## EVANS

QUEEN'S GAMBIT ACCEPTED

|  |  | SH |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 1. | P.Q4 | P.Q4 |
| 2. | N-KB3 | $\mathrm{N} \cdot \mathrm{KB} 3$ |
| 3. | P.B4 | P×P |
| 4. | P-K3 | P.K3 |
| 5. | B×P | P.B4 |
| 6. | $0 \cdot 0$ | P-QR3 |
| 7. | Q.K2 | $-\ldots . .$. |

So far, so good. Both sides may vary earlier to their own disadvantage. A speculative continuation is 7. P-K41?, NxP; 8. P-Q5, B-K2; 9. PxP, BxP; 10. QxQch, BxQ; 11. BxB, PxB; 12. R-K1, N-KB3 (Nekirche-Clark, Lelpzig Olympics, 1960) and now Euwe suggests 13. RxPch, B-K2; 14. B-K3, K-Q2; 15. R-N6, K-B2; 16. R-N3, N゙-Q4; 17. B-N5, but simply N-QB3 for Black equalizes (17. ........, P-B5?; 18, N-B3!). 7.
7. ........
P.QN4

Safest. The main alternative is 7. ........, N-B3 which I consider a shade too aggressive. The best reply is 8. N-B3 (if 8. R-Q1, P-QN4; 9. B-N3, P-B5; 10. B-B2, N-QN5 and Black gets the Bishop with a good game), PxP; 9. PxP!, P-QN4; 10. B-N3, NxPl?; 11. $\mathrm{NxN}, \mathrm{QxN} ; 12$. N-Q5!, NxN (12. ......... B-Q3 should be considered); 13. R-Q1, N-B6; 14. PxN, Q-N3; 15. Q-K5! with a bind. Evans-Bolbochon, Helsinki Olympies, 1952.

$$
\begin{array}{rlr}
\text { S. } & 1952 . & \text { B-N2 } \\
\text { 8. } & \text { B-N3 } & \text { QN-Q2 } \\
9 . & \text { R-Q1 } & \text { Q-N1! }
\end{array}
$$



## Position after 10

 Q-N1!A new move-and quite sound. The point is 11. RPPP, RPxP; 12. RxR, BxR and every thing is defended. The book move is 10. ........, B-K2 which is not only drawish, but condemns Black to passivity after 11. PxBP, $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ (11. ......., $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 1$ is now met by 12. P-B6!, BxP; 13. N-Q4!); 12. N-K5, Q-B2; 13. P-B6 (or 13. $N \times N, N \times N ;$ 14. $P \times P, P \times P$; 15. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{BxR}$; 16. QxP, NxP; 17. B-B2, R-N1; 18. Q-K2, B KB3; 19. N-B3, N-N6-. Evans-McCormick, US Open, 1952), NxV; 14. PxB, N(4)-N5; 15. P-B4, QxNP; 16. PxP, PxP; 17.. RxR, RxR; 18 Q-B3, QxQ; 19. PxQ, N-R3=. Guimard-Bazan, Buenos Aires 1960. If after 10. ........, B-K2; 11. RPxP, RPxP; 12. RxR, QxR; 13. N-B3 P-N5; 14. N-QN5, Q-R4 is at least equal for Black (Benko-Uhlmann, Buenos Aires 1960).

T1. B-B2
P-N5?
Not best. Simply 11. ........, B-K2 equalizes.

> 12. $Q N \cdot Q 2$ 13. $N \times P$ 14. $P \cdot K N 3$ !
14. P-R3, O-O; 15. N-B4, B-R7ch; 16. K-R1, B-B2; 17. P-R5 is also playable, but the text is like waving a red flag in front of a bull inasmuch as it provokes Black's reply and molds the character of the game.
14. P.KR4I?

Safer is 14. ........, O-O; 15. N-B4, B-K2; 16. P-K4 with a slight edge. The move chosen, however, presents White with grave problems. One slip can mean sudden death. The powerful threat of 15 . ......., P-R5 cannot be ignored.
15. N-B4

## 16. P.B3!

B-B2
The best and only defense! If 16. P-K4, P-R5; 17. P-B4, PxP; 18. PxP, N-B4 with a fine game for Black.

## 16.

. .......
P-N4
This logical plunge creates irremediable weaknesses, but it is the only way to continue the "attack." If 16. ........, P-R5; 17. P-N4 closes the lines. Relatively best is the attempt to consolidate with 16. ........, P-R4 (to prevent P-R5); 17. N-N5, O-O though Black's game is inferior.
17. P-K4
18. B-N5
P.N5

Now Black's "attack" comes to an abrupt standstill. But if 18. ......., PxP; 19. QxP, N-N5; 20. NxP!, $P \times N ;$ 21. RxN!, KxR (21. R2ch; 22. B-K3); 22. Q-B7ch, K-B3; 23. QxPch, B-Q3; 24. R-Q1 (among others) wins hands down. Indeed, it is to Black's credit that he constantly averts these brilliant ways to lose.

## 19. P-B4

Positionally Black is now lost. He has no more attack, his King is stranded in the center, and his $Q$-side pieces are herded like cattle. It is just a matter of time.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 19. } & \text { K-B1 }
\end{array}
$$

20. ........, 0-0-O loses to 21. P-K5 or QR-B1. Black tries to shelter his King on the K-side, but he has too many weaknesses.

## 21. QR-BI

A waiting move which strengthens White's position, Also strong is 21. B-R6ch, K-K2; 22. P-K5, N-Q4; 23. P.B5, but Black's King is better placed on K2 than KN2 as in the game.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 21. } \ldots \ldots . . & \text { K-N2 } \\
\text { 22. P-K5 } & \text { N-Q4 } \\
\text { 23. P.R31 } & \text { R.N3 }
\end{array}
$$

Again Black avoids a pretty way to lose: 23. ........, PxP; 24. QxP, R-R1; 25. B-B6ch!, $\mathrm{N} / 2 \times \mathrm{B} ; 26$. PxNch, NxP; 27. Q-N5ch, K-B1; 28. QxN and wins. There is no good defense anyway.


|  | Steinmeyer-0 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N-KB3 | 20. QxP | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathrm{N}$ |
| P-KN3 | 21. $B \times R$ | Q×B |
| B-N2 | 22. P-K5 | N-Q2 |
| P.Q4 | 23. Q-R8ch | K-K2 |
| 0.0 | 24. Q-R3ch | K-K3 |
| P.B4 | 25. Q-N3ch | Q-Q4 |
| PxBP | 26. QxQch | K×Q |
| Q-R4 | 27. R-Q1ch | K-B3 |
| B-K3 | 28. P-B4 | P-N4 |
| BXB | 29. P-N3 | PxP |
| QxBP | 30. PxP | B-B1 |
| N-B3 | 31. K-N2 | B-K2 |
| KR-Q1 | 32. K-83 | P-B3 |
| Q-Q5 | 33. P-K6 | N-B4 |
| $\mathbf{P \times R}$ | 34. P-B5 | P-R4 |
| K-B1 | 35. K-N3 | N-K5ch |
| QxNP | 36. K-R4 | N-Q3 |
| R×N | 37. RxNch | BxR |
| R-Q5 | 38. P-KR3 | Resigns |

SLAV DEFENSE

| Benko- $1 / 2$ |  | Addison-1/2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. P-Q4 | P.Q4 |  | B-K2 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| 2. P-QB4 | P-QB3 |  | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{Nch}$ | PxN |
| 3. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | $\mathrm{N} \cdot \mathrm{B3}$ |  | PxP | KR-QN1 |
| 4. N-B3 | PxP |  | Q-B4 | B-R4 |
| 5. P-QR4 | B-B4 |  | $0-0$ | $\mathbf{R x P}$ |
| 6. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 5$ | P-K3 |  | N-R2 | Q-B5 |
| 7. B-N5 | B-QN5 |  | KR-Q1 | B-B2 |
| 8. P-B3 | P.KR3 |  | P-N3 | Q.K6ch |
| 9. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N}$ | QxB |  | K-B1 | P.QR4 |
| 10. P-K4 | B.R2 |  | QR-N1 | QR-QNI |
| 11. BxP | P-84 |  | $\mathbf{R \times R}$ | $\mathbf{R \times R}$ |
| 12. B-N5ch | K-K2 | 25. | N-BT | R-Q7 |
| 13. Q-N3 | P-R3 |  | $\mathbf{R \times R}$ | Drawn |

ROUND THREE
KING'S INDIAN

| Sherwin-1/2 |  |  | Reshevsky-1/2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | P-Q4 | N-KB3 | 38. | N-B4 | P-R4 |
| 2. | P-QB4 | P-KN3 | 39. | P-R4 | N-N5ch |
| 3. | P-KN3 | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | 40. | K-N1 | K-B3 |
| 4. | B-N2 | O-O | 41. | B-R3 | K-N2 |
| 5. | N-QB3 | P-Q3 | 42. | $\mathbf{B \times N}$ | BxB |
| 6. | N-B3 | QN-Q2 | 43. | K-R2 | B-B4 |
| 7. | O-O | P.B3 | 44. | P-B5 | P.Q4 |
| 8. | P-K4 | P-K4 | 45. | N-K2 | K-B2 |
| 9. | P-KR3 | PxP | 46. | N-Q4 | K-K2 |
| 10. | NxP | R-K1 | 47. | Q-B4 | $Q \times Q$ |
| 11. | B-K3 | P-QR4 | 48. | PxQ | K-Q2 |
| 12. | Q-B2 | N-B4 | 49. | K-N3 | K-B2 |
| 13. | QR-N1 | KN-Q2 | 50. | K-B3 | P-N3 |
| 14. | P-QN3 | N-B1 | 51. | K-K3 | K-N2 |
| 15. | KR-Q1 | Q-K2 | 52. | K-Q2 | PxP |
| 16. | Q-Q2 | KN-Q2 | 53. | $\mathbf{P \times P}$ | K-R3 |
| 17. | R-K1 | P-R5 | 54. | K-B3 | K.R4 |
| 18. | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | PxP | 55. | NxPch | K-N4 |
| 19. | $\mathbf{P \times P}$ | Q-B1 | 56. | N-Q4ch | $\mathbf{K x P}$ |
| 20. | P-B3 | B-K4 | 57. | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 3 \mathrm{ch}$ | K-Q3 |
| 27. | B-B2 | Q-N2 | 58. | N -Q4 | B-K5 |
| 22. | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | R-R7 | 59. | K-Q2 | K-B4 |
| 23. | KR-Cl | P-B4 | 60. | K-B3 | B-B4 |
| 24. | N -B1 | B-B6 | 61. | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 3 \mathrm{ch}$ | K-Q3 |
| 25. | Q-K2 | R-N7 | 62. | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | B-Q2 |
| 26. | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$ | BxR | 63. | K-Q3 | B-R5 |
| 27. | N-Q4 | $\mathrm{BxN} / 1$ | 64. | K-Q2 | B-K1 |
| 28. | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ | PXP | 65. | K-Q3 | B-Q2 |
| 29. | $\mathbf{P \times P}$ | N-B3 | 66. | K-Q2 | B-R6 |
| 30. | R-K1 | $\mathbf{N / 4 \times K P}$ | 67. | K-Q3 | B-N7 |
| 31. | Q-B2 | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{B}$ | 68. | K-Q2 | B-K5 |
| 32. | R×Rch | NxR | 69. | K-B3 | P-KN4 |
| 33. | QxN | Q-K2 | 70. | BPxP | B-N3 |
| 34. | K-R2 | N-B3 | 71. | K-Q2 | B-KT |
| 35. | Q-Q2 | K-N2 | 72. | K-Q3 | K-K4 |
| 36. | P-QN4 | B-Q2 | 73. | K-K3 |  |
| 37. | N-K2 | Q-K4 |  | Dra |  |

## POSTAL CHESS PLAYERS

Play LOW COST Postal Chess with The Courier Postal Chess Club, P.O. Box 104-F, Terryville, Conn., U.S.A. Free magazine. World Wide Play too. Write for particulars.

RUY LOPEZ

| Mednis-1 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. | P.K4 |
| 2. | N-KB3 |
| 3. | B-N5 |
| 4. | B-R4 |
| 5. | $0: 0$ |
| 6. | Q-K2 |
| 7. | B-N3 |
| 8. | P-B3 |
| 9. | P-Q3 |
| 10. | R-Q1 |
| 11. | B-B2 |
| 12. | QN-Q2 |
| 13. | N-B1 |
| 14. | BxN |
| 15. | P-N4 |
| 16. | P-QR4 |
| 17. | N-K3 |
| 18. | P-Q4 |
| 19. | NxQP |
| 20. | P-K5 |
| 21. | N(3)-B5 |



CATALAN SYSTEM

| Addison-0 | CATALAN | Bisguier-1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | N-KB3 | 22. $Q \times Q$ | PxQ |
| 2. P-QB4 | P-K3 | 23. B-B1 | R-Q1 |
| 3. P-KN3 | P.Q4 | 24. N-B1 | R-Q8 |
| 4. B-N2 | B-K2 | 25. B-N2 | R×R |
| 5. 0.0 | 0.0 | 26. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R}$ | RXQRP |
| 6. P-Q4 | QN-Q2 | 27. B-Q4 | N-Q4 |
| 7. QN-Q2 | P-QN3 | 28. N-B3 | P-N5 |
| 8. P-N3 | B-N2 | 29. $\mathrm{N}(1)-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | K-B1 |
| 9. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | P.B4 | 30. K-BT | R-B7 |
| 10. P-K3 | R-B1 | 31. K-KI | P-B3 |
| 11. N-K5 | BPXP | 32. K-Q1 | R-B1 |
| 12. KPXP | R-B2 | 33. K-K2 | K-K2 |
| 13. Q-K2 | Q-R1 | 34. K-Q3 | K-Q2 |
| 14. P-B4 | $\mathbf{P \times P}$ | 35. N-B4 | P-QN4 |
| 15. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ | Q×B | 36. N-R5 | N-B6 |
| 16. $P \times P$ | P-QN4 | 37. N-Q2 | K-Q3 |
| 17. P-QB5 | $\mathbf{N x P}$ | 38. N-N7ch | K-B3 |
| 18. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{N}$ | BxPch . | 39. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B5}$ | K-Q4 |
| 19. R-B2 | BxRch | 40. N-Q7 | N-R5 |
| 20. $Q \times B$ | R-B7 | 41. Resigns |  |
| 27. Q-Q4 | Q.N3 |  |  |


|  | SICILIAN | DEFENSE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Steinmeyer-0 |  | Benko-1 |  |
| 1. P-K4 | P.QB4 | 22. R-K1 | K-R1 |
| 2. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | N-QB3 | 23. B-KB4 | Q-K2 |
| 3. P-Q4 | PxP | 24. P-KN4 | P-Q5 |
| 4. $\mathbf{N x P}$ | N-B3 | 25. N-Q1 | P-K6 |
| 5. N-QB3 | P-Q3 | 26. $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | P×N |
| 6. B-K2 | P.KN3 | 27. $\mathbf{Q \times P}$ | QxQ |
| 7. B-K3 | B-N2 | 28. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Q}$ | N-Q4 |
| 8. 0.0 | $0-0$ | 29. P-B3 | NxB |
| 9. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | B-K3 | 30. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{N}$ | B-81 |
| 10. P-B4 | Q-B1 | 31. P-N4 | P-QR4 |
| 11. P-KR3 | R-Q1 | 32. K-N2 | PxP |
| 12. B-B3 | B-B5 | 33. PxP | BxP |
| 13. R-B2 | P.K4 | 34. R-QB2 | P-B3 |
| 14. P-B5 | $\mathbf{P \times P}$ | 35. R-K4 | B-B1 |
| 15. PxP | P-Q4 | 36. B-B4 | R-Q2 |
| 16. B-N5 | P.K5 | 37. R-K6 | R-Q3 |
| 17. B-K2 | Q-B2 | 38. R-K4 | N-Q5 |
| 18. Q-K1 | BxN | 39. R-B3 | P-N4 |
| 19. $\mathrm{RP} \mathrm{\times B}$ | Q-K4 | 40. B-BT | R(1)-G. |
| 20. B-KB1 | N-Q5 | 41. Resigns |  |
| 21. Q-Q2 | N-B3 |  |  |



ROUND FOUR

SICILIAN DEFENSE

| Bisguier-1 |  | Rossolimo-0 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. P-K4 | P-QB4 | 9. B-K3 | B-K3 |
| 2. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | P-Q3 | 10. P-B3 | QN-Q2 |
| 3. P-Q4 | PxP | 11. N-Q5 | BxN |
| 4. $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | 12. PxB | N-N3 |
| 5. N-QB3 | P-QR3 | 13. P-QB4 | KN-Q2 |
| 6. B-K2 | P-K4 | 14. N-R5 | B-N4 |
| 7. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | B-K2 | 15. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ | QxB |
| 8. 0.0 | 0.0 | 16. $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | Resigns |
|  | KING'S | Indian |  |
| Berliner-1 |  |  | Mednis-0 |
| 1. P.Q4 | N-KB3 | 14. 0.0 | KR-B1 |
| 2. P-QB4 | P-KN3 | 15. Q-K2 | Q-R3 |
| 3. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | B-N2 | 16. KR-Q1 | K-B1 |
| 4. P-K4 | P-Q3 | 17. P-QN3 | P-N3 |
| 5. P-B4 | 0.0 | 18. Q-KB2 | Q-R4 |
| 6. N-B3 | P.B4 | 19. P-KB5 | BxN |
| 7. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | Pxp | 20. R-Q5 | Q-N5 |
| 8. $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | N-B3 | 21. R-N5 | Q-R6 |
| 9. B-K3 | B-N5 | 22. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ | K-N2 |
| 10. BXB | N×B | 23. B-B1 | Q-R3 |
| 11. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $\mathbf{N x N}$ | 24. P-B6ch | $\mathbf{P \times P}$ |
| 12. Q-Q1 | $\mathrm{N} \cdot \mathrm{B} 3$ | 25. B-R6ch | K×B |
| 13. R-QBI | Q-R4 | 26. QXBP | Resigns |


| Benko- $1 / 2$ |  | Sherwin-1/2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. P-K4 | P-QB4 |  | R-Q1 | P-QN4 |
| 2. $\mathrm{N} \cdot \mathrm{KB3}$ | N-KB3 |  | B-B6 | PxN |
| 3. P-Q3 | P.Q3 |  | RxN | Q.N3 |
| 4. P-KN3 | P-KN3 |  | B-Q5 | QXNP |
| 5. B-N2 | B-N2 |  | RXBP | Q-B8ch |
| 6. 0.0 | 0-0 |  | Q-B1 | QxQCh |
| 7. P-K5 | N-K1 |  | R×Qch | K-R1 |
| 8. PxP | NxP | 30. | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Rch}$ | BxR |
| 9. P-B3 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |  | BxP | P.QR4 |
| 10. B-K3 | P-N3 |  | B-Q3 | B-N2 |
| 11. P-Q4 | N-B4 |  | P-B4 | K-N1 |
| 12. P-Q5 | NxB | 34. | K-N2 | K-B2 |
| 13. PxN | N-N1 |  | K-B3 | K-K3 |
| 14. N-R3 | B-N5 |  | K-K4 | B-B6 |
| 15. Q-R4 | Q-Q2 |  | B-B1 | B-Q7 |
| 16. Q-KB4 | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N}$ |  | B-R3ch | K-B3 |
| 17. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ | P-QR3 |  | B-Q7 | K-K2 |
| 18. N-B4 | Q-Q1 |  | B-R4 | K-B3 |
| 19. P-Q6 | R-R2 | 41. | B-B2 | K-K3 |
| 20. PxP | Rxp | 42. | B-Q1 | K-Q3 |
| 21. QR-Q1 | R-Q2 |  | Dra |  |
| 22. $R \times R$ | $\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{R}$ |  |  |  |

QUEEN'S GAMBIT DECLINED

| Addison-1 |  |  | Steinm | eyer-0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. P-Q4 | N-KB3 |  | NxP | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}$ |
| 2. P-QB4 | P-K3 |  | QxN | R-R2 |
| 3. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | P-Q4 |  | Q-R2 | P-QN4 |
| 4. B-N5 | B-K2 |  | P-QB4 | P-QB3 |
| 5. P-K3 | P-KR3 |  | R(K1)-QN |  |
| 6. B-R4 | N-K5 |  |  | KR-QB1 |
| 7. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ | QxB |  | R-N2 | R(2)-8? |
| 8. $\mathbf{P \times P}$ | NXN |  | B-B1 | R-N2 |
| 9. $\mathbf{P \times N}$ | PxP |  | $\mathrm{R}(1)-\mathrm{N} 1$ | R(1)-NT |
| 10. Q-N3 | Q-Q3 |  | P-Q5 | PXQP |
| 11. N-K2 | N-Q2 |  | PxNP | BxP |
| 12. N-B4 | N-N3 |  | R×B | R×R |
| 13. P-QR4 | P-QR4 |  | Q-R4 | R×R |
| 14. P-KN3 | B-Q2 | 31. | QxQ | R-Q8 |
| 15. B-N2 | B-B3 | 32. | K-N2 | R-N ${ }^{\text {7 }}$ |
| 16. 0.0 | 0.0 |  | Q-K8ch | K-R2 |
| 17. KR-K1 | Q-Q2 |  | QxP | R(7).Q7 |
| 18. G-R2 | BxP | 35. | B-N5 | Resigns |

My game with Fischer in round 4 of the U.S. Championship was notable for the theory of the Gruenfeld Defense-in a main line, at that. It is remarkable for the moves that weren't made and why. I consumed two hours threading my way through Russian analysis which he reeled off in a half hour, not counting the twenty minutes he was late for the game. Apparently the line is not satisfactory for White if he is playing for a win, which Ieaves the state of the Gruenfeld more of an enigma than ever. After the game a rowdy kibitzer suggested a speculative 19 th move for Black (also Russian analysis), but as soon as Fischer had five minutes to himself he found the refutation (he phoned me at 3 a.m. to announce the winning line!). It is
this new analysis which is genuinely importhis new analysis which is genuinely impor-
tant. MCO (p. 290 col. 12) gives Black a plus
when he is probably lost! But another phone call the next day brought Fischer's new conclusion that the variation is most likely a draw after all!

## GRUENFELD DEFENSE

EVANS

|  |  | F |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 1. | P-Q4 | N-KB3 |
| 2. | P-QB4 | P-KN3 |
| 3. | N-QB3 | P-Q4! |

FISCHER

A rare departure for Fischer, who habitually plays the K's Indian. But no surprise inasmuch as he had selected it against Botvinnik at the Varna Olympiad, 1962. This suggests a welcome broadening of his opening repertoire.

| 4. | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B3}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 5. | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 3$ |
| 6. | QxBP |
| 7. | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ |

B.N2
PxP
$\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$

Unless White plays this natural move his early development of the Queen is pointless. Less effective is 7. P-KN3, B-K3; 8. Q-Q3, PB4! as in Evans-D. Byrne, U.S. Championship 1959. Or 7. P-K3, P-N3; 8. B-K2, B-N2; 9. O-O, QN-Q2; 10. R-Q1, Q-B1; 11. B-Q2, P-B4; 12. Q-N3, Q-B2; 13. R-QB1, QR-B1; 14. Q-R3, QN1; 15. B-K1, draw. Reshevsky-Uhlmann, Buenos Aires 1960.

| 7. | B-... | B-N5 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 8. | B-K3 | KN-Q2 |
| 9. | R-Q1 |  |

9. Q-N3, BxN; 10. PxN, N-QB3; 11. R-Q1, PK4 transposes to the text. $9.0-0 \cdot 0$ is an interesting try.
10. O.N....

N-QB3
10. B-K2, N-N3; 11. Q-B5, Q-Q3; 12. P-KR3, $\mathrm{B} \times N ;$ 13. $P \times B$, is Botvinnik-Fischer, and the reader is referred to the world champion's notes in Chess Life October, 1962.


Another main line also is 10 . ......., N-N3; 11. P-Q5, N-K4; 12. B-K2, NxNeh; 13. PxN, B-R4; 14. P-B4, BxB; 15. $\mathrm{NxB}, \mathrm{P}$-QB3 as in TurnerSherwin, U.S. Championship 1962, leading to a lively contest. White has a strong K-side attack, but Black's position is solid with opportunity for counterpunches.

$$
\text { 11. } P \times P
$$

BxN
11. ........, QNxP is an interesting alternative, but in any event Black has all the chances!

## 12. P×B <br> 13. B-R3

QNxP
Unsatisfactory is 13. B-K2, Q-R5!; 14. P-B4, N-N5.

## 14. K-K2

N×Pch
09 gives the refutation of 14
14 gives N/6-K4; 15 K 2 N-B1. N5., 14. ......., NBI. 17 QxP, QR5, 18 NX, 16. Q. N, P , $18.1 \mathrm{XN}, \mathrm{BxN}$ 19. PxB, QR-N1; 20. Q-B7, R-N8ch; 21. K-N2, QxKPch; 22. P-B3, Q-B7ch; 23. B-B2, RxR; 24. $K \times R, Q \times B$ wins.

## 14. $\ldots \ldots .$. <br> N/6.K4

Not 16. RxN?, Q-R5: Or 16. P-B4?, Q-R5; 17. BxN, Q-R4ch, etc.

| 15. $\ldots \ldots .$. | N×B |
| :--- | ---: |
| 16. Q-N5 | P-QB3 |
| 17. Q×NP | R-N1 |
| 18. Q×N | R×Pch |
| 19. K-B1 | $\ldots . . .$. |



Position after 19. K-B1

The game continued: 19. ........, QxQ; 20. RxQ, BxN; 21. RxRP, R-K1; 22. R-R4, B-N5 (or 22 . ........, R-N5; 23. RxR, BxR; 24. K-N2, RxP; 25. R-QB1 and White must draw even though a Pawn behind); 23. B-Q4!, R-B7; 24. RxB, PQB4; 25. BxP, RxB; 26. K-N2, R-B7; 27. PQR4, R-Q1; 28. K-N3, R-R7; 29. R-QB1, R/1-Q7; 30. R-B1, R-Q6ch; 31. P-B3, R/6-R6; 32. R-Q1, RxP; 33. R-Q8ch, K-N2; draw.

The interesting move, however, is 19. Q-B3!? which was played in Shamkovich-Simagin, Leningrad 1951 after which Black has a powerful attack and MCO gives him a plus. Why did Fischer not play this move and why did White permit it? Let's give this position a diagram and continue our investigation.


Position after 19. ........, Q-B3!?
White defense is not so easy.
I. 20. R-B1, Q-B6; 21. R-KN1, BxN; 22. RxB, KR-N1 threatening RxPch and R-N8 ch .
II. 20. N-K2, Q-B6; 21. N-N3, B-R31; 22. BxP, R-R1 with a powerful and probably winning attack. If $23 . \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ (the threat is ........, RxB), RxP is hard to meet.
III. Fischer's 20. B-Q4! and Black has two main lines. (A) 20, ........, Q-B6. (B) 20. ........, Q-R5. Let's give this another diagram.


Position after 20. B-Q4
Originally 20. ........, Q-R5 presented us with some trouble. We analyzed 21. R-KN1, R-Q1 (if 21. ........, R-B7; 22. R-N3); 22. QxRch, QxQ; 23. BxB, Q-R5 (if 23. ......., R-Q7; 24. RxR, QxR; 25. B-B6, Q-Q3; 26. P-K6!, Q-Q6ch; 27 . K-N2, QxN; 28. R-Q1 wins); 24. B-Q4, QxRP; 25. B-B6, R-N1; 26. R-N3 which White should win as soon as he consolidates.
Next day Fischer announced that simply 21. N-Q5! wins.

The troublesome continuation is 20 . Q-B6; 21. R-KN1, R-B7! (if 21. ........, P-QB4; 22 , BxP, BxN; 23. Q-Q3!, Q-B3; 24. R-KN3, B-any; 25. R-KB3 followed by $B \times R$ and wins); 22 R-N3 (what is better?), Q-R8ch; 23. R-Ni, QB6; 24. R-N3 with a draw by repetition.

Apparently this variation is drawish wheth er Black plays 19........., QxQ or 19........., Q-B3!? Both sides may be able to improve on our analysis. But unless White can find some way of improving earlier (before 9. R-Q1) this "long line" against the Gruenfeld gives him no winning chances whatsoever. The way that Botvinnik played (10. B-K2) is also unsatisfactory.

| Sherwin-1/2 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. | P.K4 |
| 2. | N-KB3 |
| 3. | B-N5 |
| 4. | B-R4 |
| 5. | 0.0 |
| 6. | P-Q4 |
| 7. | P-K5 |
| 8. | NxP |
| 9. | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 5$ |
| 10. | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N}$ |
| 11. | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{Bch}$ |
| 12. | R-K1 |
| 13. | P-KB3 |
| 14. PxP <br> 15. BxN |  |
|  |  |

## ROUND FIVE

## RUY LOPEZ

|  | Addison-1/2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P-K4 |  | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | B-B4 |
| N-QB3 | 17. | P-B3 | Q-N3 |
| P-QR3 |  | Q. K2 | KR-K1 |
| N-B3 |  | Q-KB2 | RxRch |
| B-K2 | 20. | RxR | R-K1 |
| $\mathbf{P \times P}$ | 21. | R×Rch | Q×R |
| N-K5 |  | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | B-N3 |
| 0.0 |  | P-KR3 | P-KR4 |
| P.Q4 | 24. | P-QR4 | K-R2 |
| P×B | 25. | N-B5 | P.R4 |
| QxN | 26. | P-R4 | Q.K4 |
| P.B3 | 27. | Q-Q4 | Q.K8ch |
| N-N4 | 28. | K-R2 | B-K5 |
| $\mathbf{Q x P}$ $\mathbf{Q \times B}$ |  | Dra |  |

SICILIAN DEFENSE

| Fischer-1 | sicilia | Reshevsky-0 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. P-K4 | P-QB4 | 28. R-KR3 | B-BT |
| 2. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | P-Q3 | 29. $\mathrm{R} / \mathrm{l}-\mathrm{R1}$ | R-B2 |
| 3. P-Q4 | $\mathbf{P \times P}$ | 30. R-R4 | P.Q4 |
| 4. $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | N-KB3 | 31. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 1$ | R-B3 |
| 5. N-QB3 | P-QR3 | 32. PxPch | $\mathbf{K \times P}$ |
| 6. P-KR3 | P-KN3 | 33. R-Q1ch | K-K3 |
| 7. P-KN4 | B-N2 | 34. R-Q8 | K-B4 |
| 8. P-N5 | N-R4 | 35. R-R8 | R-K3 |
| 9. B-K2 | P.K4 | 36. R-R3 | B-N2 |
| 10. N-N3 | N-B5 | 37. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathbf{B \times R}$ |
| 11. N-Q5 | $\mathbf{N x N}$ | 38. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ | R-K1 |
| 12. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{N}$ | N-B3 | 39. R-B7ch | K-N5 |
| 13. B-N4 | BxB | 40. P-B3ch | K-N6 |
| 14. $P \times B$ | Q-B1 | 41. K-Q3 | P-K5ch |
| 15. Q-QI | N-Q5 | 42. $P \times P$ | R-QTCh |
| 16. P-QB3 | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}$ | 43. B-Q4 | K-N5 |
| 17. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{N}$ | Q-K3 | 44. R-B1 | B-K4 |
| 18. R-QR5 | P-B3 | 45. K-K3 | B-B2 |
| 19. Q-Q5 | QxQ | 46. R-N1ch | K.R4 |
| 20. $R \times Q$ | K-Q2 | 47. K-B3 | R-Q2 |
| 21. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | BxP | 48. P-K5 | R-B2ch |
| 22. P-N5 | B-K2 | 49. K-K4 | R-B4 |
| 23. K-K2 | QR-KB1 | 50. P-K6 | B-Q1 |
| 24. B-K3 | R-QB1 | 51. B-B6 | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| 25. P-N4 | P-N4 | 52. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ | R×P |
| 26. R/5-Q1 | K-K3 | 53. K-QS | R-B7 |
| 27. R-R1 | R-B3 | 54. R-K1 | Resigns |


| Mednis- $1 / 2$ | SICILIAN | DEFENSE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Evans-1/2 |
| 1. P-K4 | P-QB4 | 30. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| 2. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | P-Q3 | 31. K-Q2 | R-B5 |
| 3. P-Q4 | PxP | 32. P-R5 | B-N2 |
| 4. $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | N-KB3 | 33. PxP | $\mathbf{P \times P}$ |
| 5. N-QB3 | P-QR3 | 34. R-Q6 | R-B7ch |
| 6. B-KN5 | P.K3 | 35. K-Q3 | K-R2 |
| 7. Q-B3 | P-KR3 | 36. R-Q7 | R-K3 |
| 8. B-R4 | B-K2 | 37. P-NS | P-KR4 |
| 9. 0.0 .0 | Q-B2 | 38. N-Q5 | K-N1 |
| 10. B-N3 | 0.0 | 39. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 7 \mathrm{ch}$ | K-B1 |
| 11. B-Q3 | QN-Q2 | 40. R-K3 | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Rch}$ |
| 12. Q-K2 | P-QN4 | 41. $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{R}$ | K-K1 |
| 13. P-QR3 | QR-N1 | 42. $K \times R$ | K $\times$ R |
| 14. N-R2 | B-QN2 | 43. $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | BxP |
| 15. P-B3 | KR-QB1 | 44. N-B4 | P-R5 |
| 16. P-KR4 | B-KB1 | 45. P.N6 | P-R4 |
| 17. B-KR2 | P-K4 | 46. K-B3 | K-K2 |
| 18. N-B5 | P-Q4 | 47. N -Q5ch | K-B1 |
| 19. P-KN4 | PxP | 48. K-N4 | BxP |
| 20. PxP | $\mathrm{N}(2)-\mathrm{B} 4$ | 49. $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P}$ | K-N2 |
| 21. N-B3 | NxB | 50. K-N5 | P-R5 |
| 22. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{N}$ | NXKP | 51. N-B3 | B-K2ch |
| 23. N-Q5 | BxN | 52. K-B5 | P-R6 |
| 24. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ | Q-B5 | 53. N-R2 | B-83 |
| 25. $Q \times Q$ | RXQ | 54. N-N4 | B-B6 |
| 26. BXKP | R-K1 | 55. N-R2 | B-Q7 |
| 27. B-Q4 | P-KN3 | 56. K-K5 | Kxp |
| 28. N-K3 | R-B3 | 57. K-Q5 | K-R4 |
| 29. R-R3 | N-B3 | 58. K-B5 | Drawn |

Steinmeyer-1/2
NIMZO-INDIAN


NEO-GRUENFELD

| Byrne-1/2 |  |  | Benko-1/2 |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 1. P-Q4 | N-KB3 | 10. O-O | PXP |  |
| 2. P-QB4 | P-KN3 | 11. B-Q2 | N(1)-QR3 |  |
| 3. P-KN3 | P-Q4 | 12. Q-K1 | P-KB4 |  |
| 4. B-N2 | B-N2 | 13. BxN | N×B |  |
| 5. PxP | NXP | 14. QxN | QXQ |  |
| 6. P-K4 | N-N5 | 15. PxQ | BxP |  |
| 7. P-Q5 | P-QB3 | 16. R-R2 | B-K4 |  |
| 8. N-K2 | PxP | 17. N(1)-B3 | Drawn |  |
| 9. P-QR3 | Q-R4 |  |  |  |

SICILIAN DEFENSE
Ressolimo- $1 / 2$
$1 / 2$

| 1. P-K4 | P |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2. | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | N |
| 3. | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q4}$ |  |
| 4. | NXP | P |
| 5. | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ |  |
| 6. | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |  |
| 7. | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |  |
| 8. | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |  |
| 9. | PXP | N |




ROUND ELEVEN

## ruy lopez

| Fischer-1 |  | Bisguier-0 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. P-K4 | P-K4 | 20. | N-R4 | P-KR4 |
| 2. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{KB3}$ | N-QB3 | 21. | P-KR3 | PxP |
| 3. B-N5 | N-B3 |  | PxP | P.N3 |
| 4. 0.0 | NxP |  | R-R1 | B-Q1? |
| 5. P-Q4 | N-Q3 | 24. | N-B5! | RxR |
| 6. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N}$ | QPxB | 25. | N-Q6ch | K-B1 |
| 7. PxP | N-B4 | 26. | $\mathbf{R \times R}$ | P-QN4 |
| 8. QxQch | KxQ | 27. | P-KB4 | K-N1 |
| 9. N-B3 | K-K1 | 28. | P-B5 | N-B1 |
| 10. N-K2 | B-K3 | 29. | P-K6 | P-B3 |
| 11. N-B4 | B-Q4 | 30. | N-B7 | B-K2 |
| 12. $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{B}$ | PxN | 31. | B-B4 | P-N4 |
| 13. P.KN4 | N-K2 | 32. | B-Q6 | R-K1 |
| 14. B-B4 | P-QB3 | 33. | BxB | R×B |
| 15. KR-K1 | N-N3 | 34. | N-Q8 | R-K1 |
| 16. B-N3 | B-B4 | 35. | NxP | NxP |
| 17. P-B3 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | 36. | PxN | RxP |
| 18. P-N4 | B-N3 |  | NxP | Resigns |
| 19. K-N2 | N-K3 |  |  |  |

SEMI-SLAV DEFENSE


| Mednis- $1 / 2$ | FRENCH | Byrne-1/2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. P-K4 | P-K3 | 19. R-KT | R-K2 |
| 2. P-Q4 | P-Q4 | 20. R-N1 | B-KN2 |
| 3. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | N-QB3 | 21. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | B-GR3 |
| 4. KN-B3 | $\mathrm{N} \cdot \mathrm{B} 3$ | 22. N-R5 | B-N4 |
| 5. P-K5 | N-Q2 | 23. N-R4 | Q-Q2 |
| 6. P-QN3 | B-K2 | 24. Q-B2 | P-K4 |
| 7. B-N2 | 0.0 | 25. N-B5 | R(2)-K1 |
| 8. P-QR3 | P-B3 | 26. NxB | $\mathbf{K x N}$ |
| 9. B-N5 | P-QR3 | 27. Q-Q2 | Q-B4 |
| 10. BXN | PxB | 28. PXP | $\mathbf{R x P}$ |
| 11. PxP | PxP | 29. $\mathbf{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ | PxR |
| 12. P-B4 | R-B2 | 30. R-K1 | R-K1 |
| 13. P-QN4 | P-QR4 | 31. N-N3 | R-K3 |
| 14. NPXP | $\mathbf{R \times P}$ | 32. Q-K3 | K-B2 |
| 15. $0-0$ | $\mathrm{N} \cdot \mathrm{N} 3$ | 33. N-Q2 | P-K5 |
| 16. B-B3 | R-R1 | 34. N-N3 | R-N3 |
| 17. P-B5 | N-R5 | 35. N-Q4 | Drawn |
| 18. B-N4 | B-B1 |  |  |
|  | SICILIAN | DEFENSE |  |
| Rossolimo- $1 / 2$ |  | Sherwin-1/2 |  |
| 1. P-K4 | P-QB4 | 20. R-B4 | B-N3 |
| 2. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | N-KB3 | 21. R-K1 | 0.0 |
| 3. P-K5 | N-Q4 | 22. Q-Q5ch | P-K3 |
| 4. P-KN3 | N-QB3 | 23. Q-Q6 | QxP |
| 5. B-N2 | P-KN3 | 24. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ | PxB |
| 6. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | N-B2 | 25. B-Q5 | PxB |
| 7. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | N-K3 | 26. R-B7 | Q-B3 |
| 8. P-B3 | P.Q4 | 27. $R / 1-K 7$ | R-R4 |
| 9. PxP e.p. | P-B4 | 28. QxNP | $\mathbf{R x P}$ |
| 10. N/4-N5 | $\mathbf{N x N}$ | 29. Q-Q6 | R-Q7 |
| 11. $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}$ | P-KR3 | 30. Q×Q | R×Q |
| 12. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | QXP | 31. RxBCh | R-B1 |
| 13. P-Q4 | PxP | 32. $\mathrm{R} / 8-\mathrm{B7}$ | R-B3 |
| 14. PxP | B-N2 | 33. R-N7ch | K-B1 |
| 15. O-O | NxP | 34. R-R7 | K-N1 |
| 16. B-B4 | Q-N3 | 35. QR-N7ch | K-B1 |
| 17. NXN | BxN | 35. RXQNP | K-N1 |
| 18. R-BI | P-N4 | Drawn |  |
| 19. B-B7 | Q-KB3 |  |  |

R-K2 B-QR3 B-N4
Q-Q2
P-K4
R(2)-KI KxN
Q-B4 RXP
PxR R-K1 R-K3
K-B2 P-K5
R-N3
Drawn

SICILIAN DEFENSE

WEAVER W. ADAMS
The death of Weaver W. Adams is a great loss for chess lovers the world over.

Sacrificing relentlessly every other consideration, and enduring even poverty (all on a lifetime background of poor health), he devoted his entire life to the theory and practice of creative chess play. He was full of enthusiasm and the spirit of adventurebut always with the soul of an artist, a poet. He loved chess dearly.

Many of his efforts took the form of discovering new ideas, and reviving interest in openings long in disfavor, and to all intents and purposes dead-such as The King's Bishop Opening, The Vienna, and The Albin Counter Gambit. Especially effective were some of his ideas for the White side of the Sicilian, one of which (P-KR3) has only recently been adopted by many, including Bobby Fischer.

As a teacher, he was stubborn, often dogmatic, not always correct. But we all can err. And he had, in compensation, a fierce love and artistry.
Many of his games are immortal struggles with touches of startling beauty-always alive, always fascinating. We must go to them again and again.

In Weaver W. Adams America and the whole world has lost a creative chess artist.
-A. E. Santasiere

Trifunovich Wins Oklahoma Open

Seventy-five players from six states swarmed into the Oklahoma City Sheraton Hotel to play in the 17th Annual Oklahoma Open, inspired no doubt by the chance to see and perhaps play against Grandmaster Petar Trifunovich of Yugoslavia. Trifunovich accepted Jerry Spann's invitation to play in the Oklahoma event as part of his current American tour. Trifunovich and Spann were opposing team captains at the 1958 Chess Olympiad in Munich.

Trifunovich's winning score of $4-1$ was equaled by no fewer than nine others and he was held to draws in the final two rounds by USCF Master Ken Smith and Expert Robert Potter, both of Dallas, Texas. Smith took second place, Dr. Bela Rozsa of Tulsa, Oklahoma was third, and Fred Tears of Dallas was fourth. The others with 4-1 scores were John Jaffary, Fort Sill, Oklahoma; Robert Potter; Ronnie Taylor, Ft. Smith, Arkansas; Tibor Rekey, Denton, Texas; John Beitling, Kansas City, Mo.; and Dennis Sims, Fayetteville, Ark.

The Oklahoma State championship trophy was won by Dr. Rozsa for the tenth (!) time. The tournament was directed by F.I.D.E. Vice-President Jerry Spann.

FROM THE NORTH CENTRAL OPEN
Milwaukee, 1962
BARCZA SYSTEM

| Theodorovitch (Toronto) |  | C. Weldon (Milwaukee) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. $\mathrm{N} \cdot \mathrm{KB3}$ | N-KB3 | 15. B-K3 | N-K3 |
| 2. P-KN3 | P-KN3 | 16. P-R3 | N-Q4 |
| 3. B-N2 | B-N2 | 17. B-B1 | N-B4 |
| 4. O-O | 0.0 | 18. R-R3 | R-Q1 |
| 5. P-B3 | P.Q3 | 19. P-QN4 | N-K3 |
| 6. P-Q4 | P-B3 | 20. R-R2 | R-Q2 |
| 7. P-QR4 | Q-B2 | 21. R-Q2 | QR-Q1 |
| 8. P-R5 | P-K4 | 22. KR-Q1 | B-R3 |
| 9. $\mathbf{P \times P}$ | PxP | 23. P-K3 | N-B1 |
| 10. KN-Q2 | QN-Q2 | 24. P-N5 | P-KB4 |
| 11. N-B4 | R-Q1 | 25. P-R6 | P-K5 |
| 12. Q-Q6 | Q×Q | 26. B-B1 | N-N3 |
| 13. NxQ | N-B4 | 27. RPxP | R×R |
| 14. NxB | KR×N | 28. RXR | Resigns |


| QUEEN'S <br> P. Trifunovich (Begrade) |  |  | PAWN GAME |  | M. Sweig Chicago) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. | P-Q4 | N-KB3 | 22. | NxB | $\mathbf{R \times R}$ |
| 2. | N-KB3 | P-K3 | 23. | $\mathbf{R \times R}$ | R-KB1 |
| 3. | B-N5 | P-B4 | 24. | Q-B6 | R-B2 |
| 4. | P-B3 | P-KR3 | 25. | Q-K8ch | K-R2 |
| 5. | B-R4 | P-QN3 | 26. | Qxp | $\mathbf{R \times N}$ |
| 6. | P-K3 | B-K2 | 27. | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{R}$ | QxP |
| 7. | B-Q3 | O-O | 28. | Q-B4 | Q-N5ch |
| 8. | $0 \cdot 0$ | PxP | 29. | K-B2 | Q-R5ch |
| 9. | BPxP | B-N2 | 30. | K-B1 | Q-R6ch |
| 10. | N-B3 | N-Q4 | 31. | K-K1 | Q-R5ch |
| 11. | $\mathbf{B \times B}$ | QxB | 32. | K-Q1 | Q-N5ch |
| 12. | R-B1 | P-Q3 | 33. | Q-K2 | Q-N8ch |
| 13. | Q-R4 | P.B4 | 34. | K-B2 | N-NT |
| 14. | NxN | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N}$ | 35. | Q-Q3ch | Q-N3 |
| 15. | R-B3 | Q-N2 | 36. | R-B7 | P-N4 |
| 16. | B-K2 | P-QR4 | 37. | R-N7 | N-B3 |
| 17. | KR-B1 | N-R3 | 38. | $\mathbf{R \times P}$ | Qxach |
| 18. | P-QR3 | P-85 | 39. | KxQ | K-N3 |
| 19. | N-K1 | PxP | 40. | R-N6 | $\mathrm{N} \cdot \mathrm{K} 2$ |
| 20. | PxP | KR-BT | 41. | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathrm{Pch}$ | Resigns |
| 21. | B-B3 | BxB |  |  | Resigns |


*After 16. Q-Q3

## SICILIAN DEFENSE

(a) The alternative method of attack from the diagram was shown to be ineffective in Bole-slavsky-Tal, Soviet team championship 1962: 16. ........ P-KB4; 17. P-KB4, QR-K1; 18. N-Q2, K-R1; 19. BxN, PxB; 20. Q-B1, Q-R4; 21. PQR4, P-N4; 22. RPxP, RPxP; 23. PxP, RxB!?; 24. RxR, P-B5; 25. PxP!, BxP; 26. R-N3!, QxP; 27. K-R1, R-KN1; 28. N-B3, Q-B4 and now instead of 29. RxB? as played, White could have remained a good pawn up by 29 . N-K5!

## SICILIAN DEFENSE

M. TAL

## M. TAIMANOV

Grandmaster Taimanov is the originator and populariser of the newest piece formation for Black in the Sicilian-........, P-K3; ........, N-QB3; and ........, Q-B2. Here he tries another variation of his main theme, aiming to control the center black squares with bishop and queen.
The idea is sound, the execution faulty. Black ought to play 11. ........, B-B5; 12. Q-Q3, P-K4; 13. B-K3, BxB with a reasonable game. What actually happens is that Tal posts his queen on an aggressive square and combines rook pressure along the queen's file with a pawn storm on the king's side. An elegant combination nets him two pieces for a rook, and Taimanov resigns a hopeless game at adjournment.

# Presented by LEONARD BARDEN 



Victor Korchnoi, 32-year-old international grandmaster, won the Thirtieth U.S.S.R. Championship played in Erevan, Armenia by scoring 14.5 in a twentyplayer field. It was the second Soviet championship for Korchnoi, who won in 1960 with exactly the same score.

Mark Taimanov and Mikhail Tal tied for second and third, a half point befor second and third, a half point be-
hind the winner. R. Holmov (13-6) was fourth and the defending champion, Boris Spassky, came in fifth with $12 \frac{1}{2}$. The names of Smyslov, Keres, Bronstein, Polugaevsky (and, of course, Botvinnik and Petrosian) were missing from this year's lineup, which was not quite as strong as some of the previous Soviet championships.

Korchnoi, a native of Leningrad, achieved his first big success in 1947 when he won the U.S.S.R. junior championship. He competed in his first U.S. S.R. championship in 1952, finishing sixth with a score of $11-8$. He was awarded the title of International Grandmaster by the World Chess Federation (F.I.D.E.) in 1956.

| 1. P-Q4 | P.Q4 | 24. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{N}$ | B-K2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. P-QB4 | PXP | 25. R-K4! | QR-N1 |
| 3. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} \mathbf{B} 3$ | N-KB3 | 26. B-B2 | B-QB3 |
| 4. P.K3 | P.K3 | 27. R-QB4 | B-Q4 |
| 5. BxP | P.B4 | 28. B-K4! | BxR |
| 6. 0.0 | P-QR3 | 29. $\mathbf{Q \times B}$ | B-B3 |
| 7. Q-K2 | P-QN4 | 30. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ ! | PxR |
| B. B-N3 | B-N2 | 31. N-B5 | Q-Q8 |
| 9. R-Q1 | QN-Q2 | 32. B-Q3 | P-QR4 |
| 10. N-B3 | P-N5 | 33. Q-K4 | Q-R4 |
| 11. N-QR4 | Q-R4 | 34. Q-KB4 | PxP |
| 12. B-Q2! | PxP | 35. N-K4 | Q-Q4 |
| 13. NXP | B-K2 | 36. B-B4! | PxB! |
| 14. P-QR3 | O.O | 37. BxQ | $\mathbf{P \times P *}$ |
| 15. PXP | Q-KN4! | 38. NxPch | K-B1 |
| 16. P-B3 | Q-KR4 | 39. N-Q7ch! | K-K1 |
| 17. P-K4 | B-Q3 | 40. N-K5! | R×B |
| 18. P-N3 | KR-Q1 | 41. QxPch | K-Q1 |
| 19. B-B3 | N-K4 | 42. N-B6ch | K-B1 |
| 20. K-N2 | NXBP! | 43. Q-K8ch | K-B2 |
| 21. $\mathbf{N} \times \mathrm{N}$ | NxP | 44. QxRch | $\mathbf{K x N}$ |
| 22. R-Q4 | N -N4 | 45. QXP | Resigns |
| 23. R-KB1 | $\mathbf{N X N}$ |  |  |

J. KOTZ

SICILIAN DEFENSE ional mothe tional method for Black when White develops his KB at KN2 against the Sicilian. Kotz chooses the wrong middle game plan (attack on Black's QRP) by 12. KR-B1: better ideas are 12. QR-B1 followed by P-QB4 (FischerPetrosian, Curacao 1962) or 12. N-R4 followed by N-N6.

In the middle game, White grabs the QRP when he shouldn't, and is crushed by a fierce attack against his unguarded back rank.



After 20.
P-Q4!
SICILIAN DEFENSE
M. TAL
L. ARONIN

A rare event-Tal is outplayed in tactical complications. He has the better of the opening (e.g. 18. Q-K2 maintains a positional advantage) but decides to sacrifice a rook . for Aronin's attack

| 1. | P-K4 | P-QB4 | 20. | QxP | N-N5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. | N-KB3 | N-QB3 | 21. | KR-K11? | QxBP |
| 3. | P-Q4 | PxP | 22. | R-KB1 | Q-N4* |
| 4. | N×P | P-KN3 | 23. | $R \times P!?$ | N-B5! |
| 5. | P-QB4 | B-N2 | 24. | P-N3 | $\mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{R}$ |
| 6. | N-B2 | P-N3 | 25. | N-Q6ch | K-N1 |
| 7. | B.K2 | B-QR3 | 26. | $\mathbf{P \times N}$ | QxBP |
| 8. | 0.0 | R-B1 | 27. | N×R | Q-B6ch |
| 9. | $\mathrm{N} \cdot \mathrm{Q2}$ | N-B3 | 28. | K-N1 | Q-B7ch |
| 10. | P-QN3 | Q-B2 | 29. | K-R1 | Q-B6ch |
| 11. | P-B4 | 0.0 | 30. | K-N1 | Q-B7ch |
| 12. | B-N2 | P.QN4 | 31. | K-R1 | QxB |
| 13. | P.K5 | N-K1 | 32. | R-G1 | Q-K7 |
| 14. | PXP | BXNP | 33. | B-N5 | Q-B6ch |
| 15. | BxB | Q-N3ch | 34. | K-N1 | B-R3 |
| 16. | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | QxNch | 35. | $\mathbf{N} \times \mathrm{Pch}$ | K-R1 |
| 17. | K-R1 | N -B2 | 36. | P-KR3 | Q-B7ch |
| 18. | B-R4 | N-K3 | 37. | K-R1 | B-B5 |
| 19. | N-B4 | Q-K5 | 38. | Resigns |  |


*After 22. ........ Q.N4

Annotated
by USCF MASTER JOHN W. COLLINS

## BEST GAME AWARD

White received the Best Game Award for this one.


This is a fundamental error in the Queen's Gambit Declined. On the one hand it relieves the pressure on the center and closes the QB file, while on the other it creates a weak pawn chain which Black readily breaks.

## 5. ........ B-K2?

The refutation is 5 . ........, P-QN3; 6 P-QN4, (6. PxP, PxP and 7. ........, P-B4 favors Black) P-QR4; 7. PxRP, (7. PxNP, BxP or 7. B-R3, RPxP; 8. BxP, N-R3) PxBP and Black wins a Pawn.

$$
\begin{array}{llr}
\text { 6. } & \text { P-K3 } & \text { O-O } \\
\text { 7. } & \text { B-Q3 } & \text { QN-Q2 } \\
\text { 8. } & \text { P-QN4 } & \text { P-QN4? }
\end{array}
$$

Having neglected to break loose with 5. ........, P-QN3, Black now neglects to free himself with 8. ........, Q-B2 and 9 . P-K4!

13. N-K2 P-N4 16. P-R4 P-N5

The inter-locking (picket-fence) pawn chain does not mean an impasse as White can break with P-B3.

| 17. N-Q2 | N-K5 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 18. N-B4 | N/2-B3 |
| R-B3. |  |
| 19. N-N6 | R-KI |
| 20. N-K5 | Q-B2 |

Preferable is 20. ........, B-Q2. One should not deny White the "opportunity" to take this Bishop!

| 21. P-B3! | PxP ch |
| :--- | ---: |
| 22. RxP | P-R4? |

23. R-B4
P.R4?

Threatening 24. B-K2 and the win of the KRP.

| 23. | K-R2 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 24. BxN ! | QPxB |
| 25. NxKP!! |  |



Position after 25. NxKP!!

White wins a Pawn and cracks the position.
25.
PxN
26. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{N}$ !
A part of 25 . NxKP.

| 26. | Bx..... | BxR |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| 27. Q-N6ch | K-R1 |  |
| 28. QxRch | K-N1 | 30. QxBch |
| K-R2 |  |  |

Or 30. N-B7 ch, QxN; 31. QxQ, B-KN2; 32. R-KB1, and mate in a few moves. 30. Q-N2
31. $Q \times Q c h \quad K \times Q$
32. $\mathbf{N x P}$ B-N2 37. R-N7ch K-B1
33. P-Q5ch K-R2 38. P-B7 Resigns
34. R-KB1 BxN

## DR. ZABIN FIRST IN MONTEREY

Dr. Zabin wins a neat ending in the final round, scored $41 / 2$ points, and finished first in the Open.

Monterey County Open Salinas, 1962
CENTER COUNTER GAME MCO 9: p. 162 , c. 5
Dr. B. Zabin (1968) S. Rubin (1932)

1. P-K4

P-Q4
2. $\mathbf{P x P}$

N-KB3
This has largely supplanted the older 2. ........, QxP. 3. $\mathrm{N} \cdot \mathrm{QB} 3$

Alternatives are 3. P-Q4, 3. P-QB4, (which usually transposes into the Panov Attack in the Caro-Kann) and 3. BN5 ch.
Mednis-Hearst (a Center Counter practitioner), U.S. Champ., New York, 1962, continued: 3. P-Q4, NxP; 4. N-KB3, PKN3; 5. B-K2, B-N2; 6. O-0, O-O; 7. P-B4, N-N3; 8. P-QR4, P-QR4; 9. P-R3, N-B3; 10. P-Q5, N-N5; 11. N-B3, P-K3; 12. B-N5, Q-Q2; 13. PxP, QxP; 14. N-N5, N-R3; 15. N/5-Q4.
4. B-B4
NxP
. B-B

NxN; 5. Q-B3, P-K3; 6.
$\begin{array}{ccc}\mathrm{Or} & \text { 4. } \ldots \ldots . . . . & \mathrm{NxN} ; 5 . \\ \mathrm{xN}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 2 ; & 7 . & \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3, \\ \mathrm{~N} & \mathrm{~B} 3 .\end{array}$

## 5. N-B3

P-KN3
After ........, P-K3, a KB fianchetto is often dubious. Possibilities are 5. ........, B-K2 and 5 . $\qquad$
6. 0.0
B-N2
7. P.Q4
?

Why take on doubled QBPs? Preferable are 7. N-K4 and 8. P-Q4 or 7. NxN, PxN; 8. R-K1 ch, B-K3; 9. B-N3.

| 7. | $\ldots . . . .$. | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 8. | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| 9. | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KI}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3$ |

Or 9. ......... P-QB4 and if 10 . B-R3, N-Q2.

| 10. N-K5 | B-N2 | 12. B-N5 | P-QB3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 11. B-R3 | R-K1 | 13. B-B4? | $\ldots . . .$. |

Better is 13. B-Q3.
14. .......
N-Q2
14. P-B4
N-B3

The intention is 16. P-B4 (taking control of the important square Q5), but Black does not cooperate. Best is 15 . Q-B3, Q-B2; 16. Q-N3.
(Continued on page 19)


# CHESS KALEIDOSCOPE by U.S. Senior Master ELIOT HEARST 

## REVIEW OF INTERVIEWS

World champion Mikhail Botvinnik and his Armenian challenger, Tigran Petrosian, will meet in their match for the world title in March or April, 1963. Botvinnik wanted to start the match in March but Petrosian insists on adherence to the rule which allows a period of four months to pass from the time the contract is signed until the match actually begins. He wants every minute of time permitted him for preparation. Just as in his over-the-board play, Petrosian doesn't like to take unnecessary chances.

The two contenders have granted several interviews to Western correspondents (particularly Britishers Golombek and Wood) over the past few months. Here are some excerpts from these question and answer sessions:

## PETROSIAN

Q. How did you play in the Candidates' Tourney in Curacao?
A. I believe that the Candidates' Tourney is the kind of event where one should play "to win" rather than "creatively." It was on this basis that I built my plans.

In past years my style has somewhat changed; it has become more active. When 1 arrived at Curacao and became acquainted with the tournament conditions I concluded that the best principle to follow would be the old tactic: not to lose.

After the tournament I heard that many sports commentators had accused me of being too peaceful. Some of them had advised me throughout the tourney to throw myself into combinations; that this was the only way to win. Many top masters avoid reading sports magazines during their competition. I have a different opinion. But, anyway, the Soviet sports journals arrived very belatedly in Curacao. In any event I would have paid no attention to their advice and in the end I was right.
Q. Did you think you would be first?
A. I think all eight competitors thought they would be first. Otherwise it would be senseless to participate in such a competition. I expected a favorable result because I had played three times in the Candidates' and each time I did better. In 1953 I was fifth, in 1956 third through seventh, and in 1959 third.
Q. What about the other players at Curacao?
A. Generally the pre-tourney favorites were Tal and Fischer. But Tal didn't really recover from his operation before the tourney. Even so, I believe that if Tal had started well in the tourney he would have finished out the tournament and would have been among the leaders, if not first.

On the way from Moscow to Curacao I spoke to Keres about Bobby and we concluded that at best he would be third. Many writers had been telling myths of an invincible Fischer.

As often before, destiny was unjust to Keres. It is much more difficult to finish second four times than to be first once. I believe that Keres has as much right as I for a match with Botvinnik.

Benko continually gets into heavy time pressure. That is his weakness as well as his strength. It is a fact that he is a rather uninteresting player but when he has no time left and only a few seconds to think then he shows real "class." Par-
ticularly under time pressure he sees much and far ahead. If he were not slightly weaker than the other players he would not have such defeats.
Q. What about your match with Botvinnik?
A. Against Botvinnik I have played five times, three times in official competition (two games were practice). All games were drawn.

Like many grandmasters of the middle and younger generation I have learned from him and shall keep learning from him. One of my first chess books was a collection of Botvinnik's games.
Q. How will the match end?
A. No one will believe me if I say I don't expect to win. Botvinnik certainly doesn't intend to lose. We shall see.

## BOTVINNIK

Q. To what factors do you ascribe the extraordinary reversal of scores in your two matches with M. Tal?
A. The results simply show that he who plays better wins.
Q. What do you consider the factors in your own character which have provided the main contribution to your success?
A. It is impossible to attain great successes without the will to win.
Q. What do you consider the main strengths and weaknesses of the British and American players you have met? What advice could you offer them?
A. In my opinion the British masters lack all-round playing strength. R. Fischer has no longer any need of my advice.
Q. In how many years do you think chess by electronic computers will become a serious factor in the game?
A. I believe the time when an electronic machine will begin to play chess well is not far off.
Q. There has been speculation as to how much your work as an electrical engineer is a distraction from your chess? What proportion of your time do you give to each?
A. Perhaps my work as an engineer both hinders and helps me as a chessplayer. I have always combined the two and not without success. While I am working as an engineer I confine myself, as far as chess is concerned, to collecting information.
Q. Would you be willing to play in a Swiss System tourney and what is your opinion of this system?
A. I do not like the Swiss System but sometimes it is necessary.
Q. What was your opinion of the general standard of play at the Olympiad in Bulgaria?
A. It is difficult to answer as I have not played over all 1400 games. But it is my impression that the games were much harder-fought than before.
Q. What do you think of the USSR team's play?
A. It was on the level of that of previous Russian teams with the exception of first board, who did not play so well as first boards in the past (Botvinnik was first board-EH).
Q. What advice can you give about preparation of teams for the Olympiad?
A. In the first instance each team member should do his own preparation. Once this is done the team should get together and discuss plans, variations, ete. for a week or so before the event.
Q. In your opinion are there any young players in the USSR who might follow in the footsteps of Tal and Spassky?
A. A few years ago there were none, but now the situation is better. While it is as yet too early to talk of a second Tal or Spassky there are some of promise. For example, there is the champion of Minsk and White Russia, Kapengut, who at 19 is already a Soviet master. And there are some others although none are Soviet masters yet.
Q. Who are the most promising younger players in the world?
A. The standard reply to this question is Fischer and of course as far as young players up to twenty are concerned he clearly excels everyone (we are not taking into consideration here Spassky since he is some years older). Other promising players are Parma and Hort. Parma should become one of the strongest Yugoslav masters and Hort will probably be as good as Filip or Pachman of Czechoslovakia.
Q. What importance do you attach to opening theory? Has it acquired more importance than it possessed in the past? Do you think the time may come when opening theory will be completely known and hence played-out?
A. Every good chessplayer must be completely equipped and a knowledge of opening theory is part of such equipment. But in addition every strong chessplayer should have something more than is published in this respect. He should have his own ideas and his own variations. Part of Petrosian's strength is that he knows something more than the others (this remark should also be taken in relation to the next question and answer). In the past one could just sit down and play but now theoretical preparation is essential. Statistically and mathematically opening theory is limited but in practice for mankind it is inexhaustible.
Q. What would you say is Petrosian's particular strength as a player?
A. Petrosian's main strength is that more than any player he knows how to play the typical middlegame positions that arise out of modern openings. He is intuitively more at home in them than any other great master.

## WHY BE CONSISTENT?

Here are two of Alekhine's annotations from the Nottingham 1936 tournament book, one of the finest volumes ever produced:

Game 20 C. Alexander vs. S. Reshevsky

| 1. | P-QB4 | P-K4 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 2. | N-QB3 | N-QB3 |
| 3. | P-KN3 | P-KN3 |
| 4. | B-N2 | B-N2 |
| 5. | P-K3 | ....... |

"This weakens the square KB3 without necessity. To be considered was 5 . P-Q3 followed eventually by P-B4."

Game 102 Dr. E. Lasker vs. C. Alexander

| 1. | P-QB4 | P-K4 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 2. | N-QB3 | N-QB3 |
| 3. | P-KN3 | P-KN3 |
| 4. | B-N2 | B-N2 |
| 5. | P-Q3 |  |

"More promising is 5. P-K3 as played (with colors reversed) by Botvinnik against Alexander in the first round."

## KNIGHTS WITH A PARANOID RUSSIAN

In an article in the London "Sunday Times" Lord Taylor, who is reputed to be an eminent authority on medicine, made the following comments on the Russian mind (If I'm not mistaken these statements by Lord Taylor also appeared in the New York Times Magazine some months ago):
"Pure paranoia is a rare mental illness whose synonym is systematized delusional insanity. Its essence is that it combines suspicion with organized tortuosity. All of us are apt to become paranoid at times, to think others are talking about us or even scheming against us. Almost always we are wrong. In business and litigation, politics and war, a small measure of paranoia may be a useful protective mechanism. But as a rule paranoid feelings are a disadvantage to both parties in the situation. There is only one place where, as a temporary
expedient, a paranoid approach is a positive advantage-on the chessboard.
"It will at once be obvious that the Russians have more than their fair share of paranoia. It is a national handicap which they are only just starting to overcome. One may guess that their favorite piece in their favorite game is the knight. Time and again one can observe them making intellectual knight's moves. For the knight, there are eight possibilities, not one of which is straightforward. Knights-move-thinking is rare among Anglo-Saxons; when they meet it, they do not recognize it and think they have been cheated."

I wonder who would most resent these gross oversimplifications: chessplayers, psychologists, or experts in international affairs? Maybe what we Americans need to equal the Russians in chess is more of that elusive "knight's-move-thinking"!

ONE-MOVERS: Before the war Salo Flohr was giving an exhibition in Prague and one of his opponents produced a five-inch pocket chess set with all the pieces virtually the same size and the colors all an indistinct grey. "I can't play with that set!" exclaimed Flohr. "Why not?" said the other. "Grandmaster Reti played with it and he was blindfolded." (Leonard Barden) . . . Paul Keres, commenting on Fischer's protest about overt consultation among the Russians at Curacao: "We chatted with each other whenever we felt like it, even after Bobby's protest. Why should I keep silent for five hours because Bobby wants me to?" . . . "Fischer is too convinced of his own superiority, if one can believe the various statements made by him to the press. Overconfidence in oneself does not do too much harm. In chess history we have cases of optimistic players who have been successful just through their optimism. But while overrating oneself need not be unprofitable, underrating one's opponent is most dangerous and may be catastrophic. Fischer certainly must have underrated his opponents at Curacao. (Former world champion M. Euwe) . . . Paul Keres, introducing E. Geller to Euwe at the 1956 Candidates' Tourney: "Here is Geller. He always plays for mate!"

ANOTHER ABSURD CONTEST: Our last contest (the gentle glossary of chess terms) was so successful that we must initiate another. The five readers who send in the best "absurd headlines" will receive free copies of the Hastings 1895 tournament book and the Nottingham 1936 volume.

Here are a few samples to start the ball rolling:
"FISCHER-RESHEVSKY MATCH TO BEGIN AT 9 A.M."
"BENKO OVERSTEPS TLME LIMIT; DOES NOT PROTEST ${ }^{\text {" }}$
"PETROSIAN SACRIFICES PIECE"
"RUSSIANS ACCUSE FISCHER OF CHEATING"
"BOTVINNIK REGAINS WORLD TITLE FOR FIFTEENTH TIME"
"FISCHER RESIGNS WORLD TITLE TO TAKE UP CHECKERS"
"JERRY SPANN WINS US OPEN TITLE"
(Send all contributions to this column to Eliot Hearst, Arling. ton Towers J-1125, Arlington 9, Virginia)

## OFFICIAL USCF EMBLEM

Be proud of your national chess organization! Wear this attractive lapel button and show everyone you're a USCF member and a chessplayer.
Gold Plated with enameled black and white miniature chess board.

Letters and crown in gold. Screws into buttonhole and remains there.
Available only to USCF members. Price includes Federal excise tax of $10 \%$. Only.... $\$ 2.20$


# Brooklyn College Team Wins Intercollegiate 

by Peter Berlow

A Brooklyn College team, led by USCF Senior Master Raymond Weinstein, eked out a tie-break victory over Columbia in the U. S. Intercollegiate Championship at LaSalle College, Pa, on December 26-29. Philip Ratner, David Daniels, David Hall, and Stuart Chagrin all turned in fine performances as Brooklyn rolled up an $18-6$ game score in the largest college chess event ever held.

One hundred and thirty-eight players, from 28 teams representing 25 schools of the United States and Canada, turned out for the tournament. Contrast this with the largest previous college tournament: 1950 when sixteen teams turned up. In that year, 9 of the teams were from New York, with entries from as far away as Miami, Michigan, Case, Yale, Penn, Temple and Princeton. This year too, we had many teams from the New York-New Jersey-Pennsylvania area, 15 in all. Slightly less than half the tournament travelled long distances to get to Philadelphia, including the University of Puerto Rico, Los Angeles State College, and Florida State University. In fact, every USCF Region but VII was represented.

For the first year invitations were sent to every college in Canada and several in Mexico and Central America. We were very pleased to see two Canadian
entries in this event, not to mention a good part of the Puerto Rican Olympic Team!

Many of the teams were experienced in this event, led by Columbia which has played in all nine team championships. Eight of them had competed in the 1960 event in Princeton, including all of the prize-winners! This may very well be the strongest college event, with five USCF-rated masters, and ten experts. Previously, the 1953 Individual Championship had held this honor, with USCF Masters Bisguier, Berliner, Burger, Harrow, Crittenden, Kaufman, Blonarovych, Henin, Popovych and Kerr competing. Naturally, most of these players were comparative unknowns at that time, achieving chess greatness only recently. It is interesting to speculate on how many of this year's college players will go on to become masters, and form the nucleus of some future US Championship event.

The talent at LaSalle was not limited to chess mastery. The coaches at the tournament included Senior Master Donald Byrne, USCF Junior Chess Chairman Mordecai Treblow, and Florida S.C.A. Prexy R.L. Froemke. Strangely enough, all three of their teams did poorly in the standings! ICLA organizing talent was there in excess, with past ICLA officers Berlow and Treblow organizing,


New ICLA President Walter Fraser awards the trophy to Raymond Weinstein of the winning team. Other Brooklyn players are (I. to r.) Stuart Chagrin, David Daniels, Philip Ratner and David Hall.

Pierce playing; and newly-elected ICLA officers Fraser and Harris playing, Paxton directing. More on that later.

A few sidelights on the tournament: as is usual in a Swiss, some teams played unusually strong opponents. This turned out to be particularly true of the Canadian entries, which accounts for their relatively low standings. It would be very difficult to select the outstanding player in the tournament; masters Weinstein, Valvo, Rivera, and Cunning. ham did well as expected. Perhaps the biggest upset was the defeat of David Grimshaw by low expert Steve Brandwein, who went on to be the only player in the tournament with a perfect 60 record! Even a most-valuable player would be impossible to select, since every player on the Brooklyn and Columbia teams had a fine record, and contributed greatly to the final scores.

Perhaps the most exciting games of the tournament were turned in by David Grimshaw and Walter Cunningham, who were both consistently in severe time trouble. Cunningham won their individual game, although Grimshaw turned in some amazing feats of blitz play, especially in his game against Rivera.

Aside from the first-round upset of Los Angeles by lowly host LaSalle " A ", there were few surprise results in the tourney. The event was an unusually even one, and even in the last round, any one of three teams could have won the Championship.

Final places were determined first by match points, then by game points; final standings were then settled by using Solkoff match points of opponents, although in reality, ties in game-points remain unbroken. By game points, Brooklyn College was declared the National Champion, and retains custody of the Harold M. Phillips Trophy for two years, as well as a $\$ 75$ USCF-credit award. Each member of the winning team also received a prize. Columbia as runner up receives a $\$ 75$ credit prize, as well as a new permanent trophy to keep as defending champions. Wayne State and Pitt will share a $\$ 50$ credit prize.

Interestingly enough, none of the players on the top two teams qualified for a board prize. These credit awards went to 1) Stephen Brandwein, Boston U. 6-0; 2) Ronald Finegold, Wayne, 5-1; 3) John Young, Pitt and Arnold Guadagnini, Poly. Inst. Brooklyn, 5-1; 4) Ralph Betza, Pitt 51/2-1/2.

A special feature of the event was a simultaneous exhibition by Dr. Petar Trifunovich on Friday evening. No one defeated the Yugoslav grandmaster in 32 games, although there were many draws.

At the annual ICLA membership meeting, new officers were elected: ICLA President, Walter Fraser, 9 Cherry Street, Willow Grove, Penna.; ICLA 1st VP, Larry Paxton, 125 W . 10th Ave., Columbus, Ohio; ICLA 2nd VP, Owen Harris, 2833 West Greenleaf Ave., Chicago 45, Ill.

All of these officers-elect are energetic and capable, and will bring much credit to college chess. Walt is well known as organizer of many Pennsylvania and Philadelphia college events, as well as the driving force and sponsor of this tournament. Larry is editor of the only college weekly chess newspaper in the country, the Ohio State University Phalanx. Owen is one of the most energetic organizers the midwest has ever seen, with a full staff of assistants responsible for college chess in Region VI. These people deserve your support and cooperation. Remember to send in news and all results to the ICLA officer nearest you (or to this columnist) and don't neglect that important ICLA membership application!
As tournament director, I was so impressed by the facilities LaSalle offered for this event, that I would like to insert a few more very necessary superlatives. This was the finest tournament site ever found for a college tournament, perhaps for any such event. A spacious, well-lighted ballroom, in a new, wellequipped college union building; a cafeteria and store one floor below, stores one block away. Accommodations in the LaSalle dorms were superb, and close by. The cooperation of the staff at LaSalle, and of the team members themselves in arranging and maintaining the tournament, was stupendous. George Marker especially deserves a heap of credit for doing a lion's share of the work, all while playing on the LaSalle "B" team. Walt Fraser was, of course, scurrying about on errands, while competing for the "A" team. To top it all off, the publicity for the event was the greatest ever, with full AP coverage, good local publicity, and even an appearance by Berlow, Fraser and Weinstein on a local daytime radio show!

Well, what does next year hold in store? First of all, we will be preparing for the ninth National Intercollegiate Individual event. It's unofficial now, but there will be a trophy for the top 4 -man team in the event next year which will be worth winning! So: plan to send not only your club champion, but your whole team to the Nationals next year. We broke records in 1961 with 50 players; let's double that in 1963.

If your club wants to sponsor the 1963 National Intercollegiate event, the time to start working is now! Bids for the tournament will be accepted by the ICLA President (Walt Fraser) through June 1st. Your bid should include: a prize fund of $\$ 300$ or more; good playing space; inexpensive accommodations for over 100 players; and a group of energetic workers who will be willing

1962 NATIONAL INTERCOLLEGIATE TEAM CHESS CHAMPIONSHIP
LaSalle College, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
December 26-29, 1962

|  |  | Final Team Standings |  |  |  |  | matches games |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I. | BROOKLYN COLLEGE "A" Brooklyn, N. Y. | $\times \times{ }^{4}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3 \frac{31}{2} \\ \times 111 \end{array}$ | $\mathbf{v}^{2}$ | $x_{x}^{3 \frac{12}{2}}$ | ${ }^{3}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 111 \end{gathered}$ | 5 -1 | 18 |
| II. | columbia college New York, N. Y. | $x x^{4} v i$ | $\begin{array}{r} 31 \\ \times v i 1 \end{array}$ | ${ }_{112}^{2 \frac{1}{2}}$ | $x 1^{3}$ | $1$ | $\mathbf{x}^{3}$ | $5 \cdot 1$ | 17 |
| III. | WAYNE STATE UNIV. Detroit, Michigan | $\mathrm{vill}^{21}$ | ${ }_{1 x}^{4}$ | $1_{11^{\frac{1}{2}}}$ | $v^{3}$ | $x^{3} v$ | $1^{2}$ | $4 \frac{1}{2}-1 \frac{1}{2}$ | 16 |
| Iv. | UNIV. OF PITTSBURGH Pittsburgh, Penna. | $\text { x } x^{4} 111$ | $x^{2} x$ | $\mathbf{x}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | $x_{11}^{3}$ | $\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{V}}^{\mathbf{3}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21 \\ & v_{1}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | 412-12 | 16 |
| v. | UNIV. OF PUERTO RICO Rio Piedras, P.R. | $\mathrm{xiv}^{4}$ | $x{ }^{21}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | III | $x x^{3 \frac{1}{2}}$ | ${ }_{\times 1}^{2}$ | 4-2 | 15 |
| vi. | POLY. INST. OF BROOKLYN Brooklyn, New York | $x x^{2} i v$ | $x v$ | $\mathbf{x} x^{1 \frac{1}{2}}$ | $x x^{4} v i$ | $x v_{11}^{21}$ | $1 v^{12}$ | 31-21 | 151 |
| VII. | BROOKLYN COLLEGE "B" Brooklyn, New York | xIII | $\begin{array}{r} 31 \\ \times \times 11 \end{array}$ | $\stackrel{1}{1}$ | $x x^{3} v$ | vili | $x_{1 v}^{2}$ | 31-21 | 131 |
| VIII. | FAIRL. DICKINSON UNIV. Rutherford, N.J. | $1112$ | $x^{2} v y_{1}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ \text { x } \end{gathered}$ | $x^{3}$ | $\mathrm{vil}^{112}$ | $x x_{1}^{22}$ | 31-21 | 131 |
| IX. | CORNELL UNIV. " $A$ " Ithaca, New York | $x \times 4$ | iI | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ v_{1} \end{gathered}$ | $\times 1 \frac{11}{12}$ | xilt | $\times 21$ | 31-21 | 13 |
| X. | LOS ANGELES STATE C. Los Angeles, Calif. | $x v^{11}$ | x×iv | $x_{11}^{2}$ | $x^{3} \times 1$ | $\begin{aligned} 21 \\ \times 1 \end{aligned}$ | $11$ | 31-21 | 13 |
| XI. | UNIV. OF TORONTO Toronto, Ont., Canada | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ \times 1 x \end{gathered}$ | $\times 11$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21 \\ & 12 \end{aligned}$ | $11^{1}$ | $x^{1 \frac{1}{2}}$ | $v^{2}$ | 31-21 | 121 |
| XII. | UNIV. OF MICHIGAN Ann Arbor, Michigan | $x v_{111}^{21}$ | $x_{1}^{1 \frac{1}{2}}$ | $x^{2}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ \text { IV } \end{gathered}$ | $x v^{21}$ | $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{3}}$ | 312-21 | 121 |
| XIII. | OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY Columbus, Ohio | $v_{11}^{21}$ | $1^{1}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ \text { xviI } \end{gathered}$ | $x \times{ }^{3 \frac{1}{1}}$ | ${ }_{1 x}^{2}$ | $x_{x}^{3}$ | 31-21 | 121 |
| XIV. | ursinus college Collegeville, Pa. | $v^{0}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2 \frac{21}{2} \\ \times \times 11 \end{array}$ | $x v^{2 \frac{1}{2}}$ | $1 x^{2 \frac{1}{2}}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ \text { III } \end{gathered}$ | $v_{1 I}^{2}$ | 31-21 | 101 |
| xV. | LaSALLE COLLEGE "A" Philadelphia, $\mathbf{P a}$. | $x^{21}$ | $\stackrel{0}{v_{1}}$ | $\times{ }^{1 \frac{12}{2}}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2 \frac{21}{2} \\ \times \times 111 \end{array}$ | $111$ | $\mathrm{xx}^{3} \mathrm{v}$ | 3-3 | 11 |
| xVI. | TEMPLE UNIVERSITY Philadelphia, Pa. | $x \times 1$ | $v^{1 \frac{1}{2}}$ | $x \times x^{4}$ | $x v_{11}^{2}$ | IV | vill | 21-31 | 131 |
| XVII. | PENN. STATE UNIV. University Park, Pa. | $\times \times{ }^{3!}$ | $11^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ \times 111 \end{gathered}$ | $x^{2} \vee 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 / 2 \\ & \mathrm{vi} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \frac{1}{1} \\ & 1 x^{2} \end{aligned}$ | 212-31 | 12 |
| XVIII. | boston college Boston, Massachusetts | $\mathrm{XII}^{1 / 2}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1 \frac{12}{2} \\ \times \times \vee \end{array}$ | $x x^{2} 11$ | $x \times{ }^{1 \frac{1}{2}}$ | $x \times{ }^{2 \frac{1}{2}}$ | $x \times \frac{21}{2!}$ | 21-31 | $11 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| xIX. | BOSTON UNIVERSITY Boston, Massachusetts | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ \times 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{x^{3}}{ }$ | $x^{2} \times 1$ | vill | $x x^{2} v 1$ | $x^{2}$ | 21-31 | 11 |
| $\mathbf{x x}$. | MCMASTER UNIVERSITY Hamilton, Ont., Canada | $x \times v i I I$ | $\text { iv }^{2}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \frac{1}{2} \\ & \mathrm{v}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | $1^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | $v^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | x'III | 21.312 | $10 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| $\mathbf{x x i}$. | UNIV. OF CONNECTICUT Storrs, Connecticut | $x \vee i^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | $x x^{2 \frac{1}{2}} 11$ | $x_{x}^{2}$ | $x^{1}$ | $x \times_{x}^{3} v$ | $\mathrm{X}_{11}^{\mathbf{1}}$ | 21-31 | 10 |
| XXII. | LaSALLE COLLEGE "B" Philadelphia, Pa. | $\stackrel{0}{1 \times}$ | $\mathrm{v} \\|^{\frac{1}{2}}$ | $x \stackrel{2}{\prime \prime} I I$ | $x \left\lvert\, I^{\frac{1}{2}}\right.$ | $x x^{3} v I I I$ | $x \times \sin _{11}$ | 21-31 | 912 |
| XXIII. | FLORIDA STATE UNIV. Tallahassee, Fla. | III | $\begin{array}{r} 112 \\ \times 12 \end{array}$ | $\underset{\text { XXVIII }}{4}$ | $x v^{1 \frac{11}{2}}$ | $x x^{3} v$ | xvill | $2-4$ | $11_{2}^{1}$ |
| XXIV. | UNIV. OF TOLEDO Toledo, Ohio | $\stackrel{2}{v i}^{2}$ | $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{x}}$ | virt | $x{ }^{2!}$ | $x^{1} \times 1$ | $x^{2} \times$ | 2.4 | $9 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| xxv. | CORNELL UNIV. "B" Ithaca, New York | $x \vee \frac{1}{1}$ | $x v_{111}^{2 \frac{2}{2}}$ | $x^{0}$ | vıl | $\text { x }{ }^{1} \text { III }$ | $x \times{ }^{4}$ | 2.4 | 9 |
| XXVI. | Lemoyne college Syracuse, N.Y. | $11$ | $v_{1 I I}^{2}$ | $x \times \operatorname{lin}^{3 \frac{1}{2}}$ | $\stackrel{0}{v i}$ | $x_{1 x}^{2}$ | $\underset{x v}{1}$ | 2.4 | 81 |
| XXVII. | WRIGHT JUNIOR COLLEGE Chicago, Illinois | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $x \times 1^{1 \frac{1}{2}}$ | $x \times \frac{\sqrt[3]{2}}{1}$ | $x \times{ }^{3!} 111$ | xvill | xxil | 1 -5 | $7 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| xXVIII. | bloomsburg state coll. Bloomsburg, Penna. | $\times x_{x}^{0}$ | $x_{x \mid x}^{1 x}$ | $\text { x } \times \underline{0} \text { III }$ | $x \times v^{\frac{1}{1}}$ | $\mathrm{xx}^{1} 11$ | $x \times 0$ | 0.6 | 21 |

to devote themselves to make the tournament a success. Let LaSalle College 1962 be an example for the future!

The sponsor will be selected as soon after June 1st as possible on the basis of the attractiveness of the bid, and of general accessibility to the tournament site. "Extras" in your bid, such as a banquet, special events, additional funds, etc. will help your chances. Everyone has a chance, and even the smallest college can sponsor a big event, so start planning now. Keep college chess moving forward, along with the USCF!

Send college chess news, comments, and queries to: Walter Fraser, 9 Cherry Street, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania.

All correspondence concerning the U.S. Student Team should be addressed to: Peter Berlow, Chemistry Dept., Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.

# LESSONS 

## IN THE

ENDGAME by DR. ERICH W. MARCHAND

## ENDGAME LESSON VIII

## 1. Transition to the Endgame

One of the important reasons for studying endgames systematically is because of their relation to the middlegame. In the middle-game one frequently faces decisions of whether to exchange Rooks or not, whether to exchange minor pieces or not (and if so, which way?) whether to complicate or simplify, and so on. The importance of doubled Pawns, backward Pawns, isolated Pawns, balanced or unbalanced Pawn structures, better King position and numerous other points bear on the decision of whether to try to head for an endgame or not and if so what type to try for.

## 2. An Illustrative Game

The following game is given in full to show in some small way how the middle-game is related to the endgame. Naturally, one cannot generalize too much from one example since this problem can arise in many different forms.

## IRREGULAR OPENING



After 4. ........., PxP; 5. NxP Black will have to suffer for his extra Pawn because of White's quick development. The text-move indicates that Black prefers to fight the battle on a different ground, returning the Pawn but leaving White with awkward development.

| 5. | BxP | B-B4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6. | B.QB4 | P-K3 |
| 7. | KN-K2 | B-K2 |
| 8. | Q-Q2 | N-Q4 |
| 9. | NxN | PxN |
| 10. | B.Q3 | Q-Q2 |
| 11. | P-B3 | N-B3 |
| 12. | Q-B2 | BxB |
| 13. | QxB | P-B4 |
|  | P-KR4 |  |

With 14. O-O, O-O the game would take on a peaceful character. However, White's last move indicates his intention to castle long and attack on the K -side.

| 14. | 0.0 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 15. O.O.O | N-R4 |
| 16. K-N1 | P.QN4 |
| 17. P-R5 | P-N5 |


| 18. P-N4 | N-B5 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 19. B-B1 | QR-NI |
| 20. | NPxP |



Here Black is faced with a major decision: convert to an endgame by QxP , forcing the exchange of Queens, or avoid it with RxP. In either case Black has some advantage because of the advanced position of his Knight and weakness of White's KBP. However, when the two players are attacking on opposite sides, as here, great complications can arise, in which minor positional advantages may not make much difference.


This leads to the loss of a Pawn. A number of plausible alternatives such as P-N3 or R-Q3 or P-B4 could be considered.

| 22. |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| 23...... | R×BP |
| 24. | P×P |
| P.-R4 |  |
| 2. K-B2 | R×P |
| 26. | R-R3 |

With no fast way to make progress Black nails down the QP, freeing the defending Rook for more important duties.

| 27. R-N1 | B-B3 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 2. R-KB3 | R-KB1 |
| 29. R(1)-B1 | R-K1 |
| 30 R R 1 )-B2 | B-R5 |
| 31. R-R2 | R-R2 |

Black invites more exchanges knowing that the closer he comes to a pure King and Pawn ending the better his winning chances become. However, there are exceptions to this since pure Rook and Pawn endings are often drawish even with an extra Pawn.
32. RxB
33. K-Q3
RxNch
R-KI

Less enterprising but also safer than 33. ........, R-K8; 34. R(4)-B4.

| 34. R(4)-B4 | R-N2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 35. K-B2 | P-R3 |

A useful move preventing P-R6 as well as giving the King some air and also fixing White's RP as a later target.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 36. P-N3 } & \text { N-Q3 } \\
\text { 37. B-R3 } & \text { N-B2 }
\end{array}
$$

An interesting idea: The Knight will go to N4 so that White's RP cannot be defended from the side. Despite all kinds of general principles one can learn about endgames, every one is a little different from the others. It is still necessary to look for special features and to find devices to exploit positional advantages by means of combinatorial methods.

| 38. B-B5 | R-K7ch |
| :--- | ---: |
| 39. K-Q1 | R-KR7 |
| 40. R-K3 | $\ldots \ldots .$. |
| or 40 R-B5, | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 4$ |
| 40. | RxRP |
| 41. R-K8ch | K-R2 |
| 42. R-QB8 | N-N4 |
| 43. R(4)-B8 | RxP |
| 44. R-R8ch | K-N3 |
| 45. RxBPch | K-B4 |
| 46. R-B8ch | K-K5 |

Black is happy to see his King driven forward since it becomes a useful piece and there is little danger of his being checkmated with so little material left.
Black should win casily now, but there are always tricks to guard against.

| 47. K-B2 | R-N6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 48. R-B2 | K-K6 |
| 49. R-Q2 | N-K5 |
| 50. R-Q3ch | K-B7 |
| 5I. RxR | KxR |



White is fighting back well. He now recovers one of his Pawns.
52. B-B8!

Not 52. R-N6ch, R-N4 or 52. R-B7, P-N4. Black gets one Pawn but cannot stop the other.

| 52. ....... | R-N4 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 53. R-B7 | P-R4 |
| 54. BxP | P-R5 |
| 55. B-K5ch | K-N7 |
| 56. R-KR7 | P-R6 |
| 5. K-Q3 | N-N6 |
| 58. K-K3 | P-R7 |
| 59. BXN | RRNCh |
| 60. K-B4 | R-KR6 |

Avoiding a final trap in 60 ........., $\mathbf{P}$. R8(Q); 61. RxQ!, KxR?; 62. KxR and White wins the King and Pawn ending. 61. Resigns

## 3. A Position Revisited

The position below was given in our last article (C.L. September, 1962) with the assertion that, even with Black to move, White wins.


Robin Ault has pointed out that Black has a drawing line based on the particular positions of the Rook and two Kings. The main line is

## K-N6

Black threatens K-B6. For instance 2. P-R6, K-B6; 3. K-N1 (3. K-K1, K-K6, etc.), R-N2ch; 4. K-R2, R-R2ch; 5. K-N1, R-N2ch; 6. K-B1, R-KR2, etc.
2. K-K2
K-B5
3. K-Q3
........

Or 3. P-R6, K-K5; 4. P-N6, R-R7ch; 5.

K-B1 (5. K-K1, K-K6), K-B6; 6. K-N1, R-R1; 7. P-R7, R-N1ch; 8. K-B1, R-KR1; 9. P-R8(Q)?, RxQ; 10. P-N7, R-R8 Mate.

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
\text { 3. } \\
\text { 4. } & \text { K-B4. } & \text { K-K4 } \\
\hline
\end{array}
$$

Or 4. P-N6, K-Q4; 5. P-R6, K-B3; 6. P-R7, K-N2; 7. P-B6ch, K-R1; 8. K-B4, R-R3; 9. K-N5 (9. P-B7, R-R1 and 10. ........, K-N2, but not 9. ........, K-N2; P-R8 (Q)ch, KxQ; 10. P-B8(Q)ch), RxP.


Here Ault gives the line 6. ........, $\mathbf{R}$ QB5 followed by RxP and draws. But this analysis is not correct because of 6. ........, R-QB5; 7. P-N6, RxP; 8. P-N7,

R-B8; 9. K-N2 winning. However, in the diagram position Black draws by
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { 6. } & \text { 7...... } \\ \text { 7. } & \text { P-R6 } \\ \text { 8. } & \text { P-R7 }\end{array}$
K-Q3
K-B2
R-R1

In fact this final position would be won for Black. So White does best to refrain from pushing the RP.

Returning to the first diagram position it appears that White could win if the Black Rook were at KR3 instead of KR2. The line runs

| 1. | …. | K-N6 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 2. | K-K2 | K-B5 |
| 3. | P-R6 | K-K5 |
| 4. | P-R7 | R-R7ch |
| 5. | K-Q1 | $R-R 7$ |

Or 5. ........, K-Q6; 6. P-R8(Q) preventing R-R8 Mate.

| 6. | P-N6 | K-Q6 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 7. | K-B1 | K-B6 |
| 8. | K-N1 | R-R5 (or R4) |
| 9. | P-R8(Q) | RxQ |
| 10. | P-N7 | R-QN1 |
| 11. | P-B6 | K-Q6 |
| 12. | K-R2 | ....... |

which wins. But not 12. P-B7?, RxPch winning!

There seem to be two lessons to be learned (1) Rook and Pawns are treacherous and (2) never aspire to become an annotator.

## COLLINS-

(Continued from page 13)
15.
P-QR4!
17. Q-B3
Q-B2
16. B-B4 N-Q4
18. BxN
........

As a result of the thirteenth and fifteenth moves, with 18. ........, P-QB4 threatened, this undesirable capture is practically forced.
18.
........ .

KPxB?
Correct is 18. $\qquad$ BPxB ! with lasting, telling pressure on the backward, doubled QBPs.

> 19. R-K3
> 20. Q-K2
P.QB4

Black threatened 20. ........, PxP; 21. PxP, QxP. But 20. Q-B2 is more precise.

| 20. ....... | B-QR3 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 21. Q-B2 | P-B3 |
| 22. $N$-N4? | ....... |

This gives Black a distinct advantage. Correct is 22. N-B3 and if PxP 23. NxP!
$\qquad$ R-K5??
Black tosses it back - losing a Pawn and probably the game. With 22. ........, P-R4!; 23. RxR ch, (forced) RxR; 24 , N-K3, Q-B3! (24. ........, PxP?; 25. NxP!) the two Bishops and superior pawnframe wuold give White a very hard time.

| 23. $R \times R$ | $P \times R$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 24. $P \times P$ | $P \times P$ |
| 25. $Q \times P$ | $Q \times Q$ |

If 25. ........, R-QB1; 26. Q-Q5 ch. 26. $B \times Q$

P-B4
If 26. ........, P-R4; 27. N-K3, P-B4; 28. B-Q4, R-Q1; 29. R-Q1, should win.
27. N-K5

P-N4?
Here, and on the next move, R-N1 should be played.
28. P-N3

PxP
29. PxP
B-R3
30. K-B2!
K-N2

Not 30. , BxP??; 31. R-N1 ch, B-N4; 32. RxB ch, K-R1; 33. N-B7 mate.
31. K-K3 R-QB1
32. B-K7!


Position after 32. B-K7!
White constructs a model mating pattern.
32. ${ }^{\text {33...... }} \begin{array}{r}\text { RxPch } \\ \text { RxP }\end{array}$
34. R-NIch B-N4
35. RxBch

Resigns
On 35. ........, K-R1 or 35. $\qquad$ K-R3; 36. N-B7 mates.

## SHAPIRO-DENKER

Eugene Shapiro, Brooklyn schoolteacher and third prize winner in the tournament (America's strongest club tournament), wins an instructive ending from former U.S. Champion Arnold S. Denker.

Manhattan C. C. Championship New York, 1962<br>NIMZO-INDIAN DEFENSE<br>MCO 9: p. 274, c. 49 (m:A)

## E. Shapiro (2257) <br> 1. P-Q4 N-KB3 <br> 2. P-QB4 P-K3 <br> A. S. Denker (23I8) <br> 3. N-QB3 B-N5 <br> 4. P-B3

This unusual fourth is apt to transpose into the Rubinstein Variation.

## 4.

An alternative is 4. ........, P-B4; 5 . P-Q5, BxN ch!; 6. PxB, Q-R4; 7. B-Q2, P-Q3; 8. P-K4, O-O; 9. B-Q3, QN-Q2.

## 5. P-QR3 $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N}$ ch

Taimanov cites 5. ........, B-K2; 6. P-K4, PxKP; 7. PxP, P-K4; 8. P-Q5, O-0; 9. N-B3, N-N5; 10. B-Q3, B-QB4; 11. Q-K2, B-B7 ch; 12. K-Q1, B-Q5; 13. K-B2, PQB4; 14. R-B1.

Tal-Keres, Candidates, Yugoslavia, 1959, continued: 5. ........ B-K2; 6. P-K4, PxKP; 7. PxP, P-K4; 8. P-Q5, B-QB4; 9. B-N5, P-QR4; 10. N-B3, Q-K2; 11. B-Q3, QN-Q2; 12. Q-K2, P-R3; 13. B-Q2, P-B3; 14. N-QR4, B-Q5.

$$
\begin{array}{llr}
\text { 6. } & \text { PxB } & \text { P-B4 } \\
\text { 7. } & \text { BPxP } & \text { KPxP }
\end{array}
$$

Vladimirov-Lein, USSR Champ., 1962, went: 7. ...., NxP; 8. PxP, P-B4; 9. P-K4, PxP; 10. Q-B2, O-O; 11. QxP, Q-R4; 12. B-Q2, QxP/4; 13. B-Q3, N-KB3; 14. QQB4, QN-Q2. 8. P-K3

Now it is the Rubinstein Variation.

```
8. ....... O.O
9. B-Q3 N-B3
```

The usual way is 9. ........, P-QN3; 10. N-K2, B-R3, or 10. ........, B-N2. 10. N-K2 N-KR4

Black takes measures to prevent P-K4. 11. O-0 P-B4 12. Pxp
........
This is to open diagonals for the two Bishops and to avoid 12 . ........, P-QB5, rather than to win a Pawn. (Continued on page 25)

## STRATEGY AND TACTICS

This game, played in the finals of the world team championship at Varna, shows an important defense to the Ruy Lopez which is all the rage in master chess at the moment. Notes are by Soviet grandmaster Ewfim Geller, specially contributed to CHESS LIFE.

| E. Geller <br> (Soviet | Union) <br> RUY | A. Mantanovic <br> (Yugoslavia) |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
|  | RUPEZ |  |

This defense to the Ruy Lopez was invented by Smyslov. Although the variation has been played many times in master chess during the last year, the best plan for White hasn't been found yet; or, at any rate, no way is known for White to secure an advantage. Every new game with this opening is interesting, with White trying new ways of deploying his pieces.

Black's plan is to play R-K1; and ........ B-KB1; followed by ........, B-QN2; combining an attack against the white KP with solid defense of his own king's position. 9. ........, P-KR3 has to be played as a preliminary to ........, R-K1 to stop White from replying strongly with N-N5.

## 10. P-Q4 <br> 11. QN-Q2 <br> 12. P-QR4

R-K1
B-B1
........
White's idea is to divert Black's QB from its 'natural' square QN2 to a more passive one at Q2; but the plan is only convincing because Black makes a mistake on his thirteenth move.
12. ........ B-Q2

In a couple of Soviet games earlier this year, Black still continued 12. ........, B-N2 but then White gets the advantage by shutting out the bishop with 13 . P-Q5, e.g. 13. ........, N-K2; 14. P-B4, P-N5; 15. P-B5!, or 13. ........, N-N1; 14. B-R2!, P-B4; 15. PxP e.p. and the white KB has a fine open diagonal. If Black abstains from ........, P-QB4, White gains considerable space on the queen's side by P-QN4. Matanovic's move is better than 12 B-N2. Now, 13. P-Q5 would be harmless because of 13 . ........, N-QR4 and, since 14. B-R2? loses the QRP, White has to be content with 14. B-B2, P-B4 and a level position.

## 13. B-B2

We can already see here an advantage of the Smyslov system; the natural Lopez continuation of 13 . N-B1? would lose the KP, so that White requires another protecting move. I also rejected 13. PxNP here-after 13. ........, RPxP and the exchange of rooks, White has nothing. 13.

## P-N3?

This appears a natural and even routine move, preparing to regroup Black's KB at KN2 and perhaps planning
to move the KN and advance ........, P-KB4. Yet from now on, Black has a passive and difficult game.

The best plan was 13 . ........, P-N5! so that if 14. P-Q5, PxP!; 15. PxP, N-QR4 and the blocked position is equal, since White is deprived of the chance of a pawn roller on the queen's side. It's interesting to note that, were White's QN at QN1 or KB1, Black's counter-plan would not work: he would have no zwischenzug attacking the white N .

If, after 13. ........, P-N5; White plays 14. N-B1, then 14. ........ NPxP; 15. NPxP, PxP; 16. PxP (16. NxP, N-QR4), N-QN5! followed by ........, P-QB4. The technique of a double pawn swap to secure the square QN5 for the black QN is a recurring one in the closed Ruy Lopez, which it is useful to know about.

Another playable idea for Black is an immediate 13. ........, PxQP; 14. NxP (if 14. PxQP, Black repeats the Steinitzian plan of 14. ........, N-QN5 and P-QB4), NxN; 15. PxN, P-B4 with chances for both sides.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 14. P-Q5 } \\
& \text { 15. P-QN4 }
\end{aligned}
$$

N -K2

15. N-R2

Black's plan for the middle game is to advance ........, P-KB4; White's is to make use of his space advantage and potential open files on the queen's side. As the game developed, my idea became to play strategically on the queen's wing, while holding back the black counterplay by tactical threats.

Though the ........, P-KB4 idea is not satisfactory for Black, the alternative method of freeing his game by 15. P-B4 also doesn't work because of 16 . PxP e.p., BxP; 17. N-N3 followed by N-R5 strengthening White's queen's side grip. If after 15. ........, P-B4; 16. PxP e.p., NxBP; 17. B-N3 and Black's ........, P-KN3 has lost much of its point.

Readers who like to play the Ruy Lopez should take special note of the usefulness of P-QN4 for White in the closed variations of the opening. Besides gaining space, it often acts as a shield for a minor piece on QN3.

## 16. P-B4

PxBP
Black must take, otherwise White plays 17. BPxP and 18. P-R5.

## 17. NxBP

B-N2
Now begins an interesting phase of the game in which Black strives to advance ........, P-KB4 while White combats it by tactical ideas. Here if 17. ........, P-KB4;
18. B-N3!, (threat 19. N/4xP, PxN; 20. P-Q6 ch, K-R1; 21. NxP!), K-R1; 19. KNxP! If 17. ........, P-KB4; 18. B-N3, K-N2 (to escape the fork); 19. B-N2! and Black is in bad shape, e.g. 19. N-N1; 20. KNxP!, PxN; 21. P-B4 and White's attack is good value for a piece.

## 18. B-N3

Still preventing ........, P-KB4 because of the knight sacrifice.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 18. ...... } & \text { K-R1 } \\
\text { 19. B-N2 } & \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 1
\end{array}
$$

Black thus gives up the idea of ........, P-KB4 and changes his plan to one of simplifiying exchanges on the king's side.

If here 19. ........, P-KB4; I intended 20. KNxP!, PxN; 21. NxP, R-KB1; 22. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q6}, \mathrm{PxP} ; 23$. QxP threatening 24. QxN! and mate.

## 20. QR-B1

The positional attack on the queen's side continues; the black QBP can only be passively defended.

## 20. ....... <br> 21. $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}$ <br> $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 4$ <br> 22. Q-Q2 <br> B-KB3

Black hopes to bring his 'bad' bishop into play. A lesser evil was 22. ........., QxQ; 23. NxQ, though White has good chances with his attack on the QB file. 23. Q-Q3!

Now White has won a tempo; the bishop at KB3 gets in the way of ........, P-KB4.
23.
. ........
KR-N1
Black wants to protect his QBP by ........, B-Q1 while keeping his rooks connected.

## 24. N-R5!

The winning manoeuver. Should Black now defend his QBP in the obvious way by 24 . $\qquad$ , B-Q1; then 25. P-B4!, QxP; 26. R-B1 and White breaks through to KB7.
If 24. $\qquad$ R-R2; 25. R-B4, followed by B-B1-K3; so Black has to take the QNP.


## 25. B-B3

If this hadn't been a team tournament game, I would probably have played the complicated line 25 . RxP!, B-Q1; 26. $\mathrm{RxB}, \mathrm{BxN} ; 27$. P-B4!, QxP; 28. R-B1, B-N3 ch; 29. K-R1, B-B7; 30. Q-K2, which probably wins; but in this case I decided to choose a simpler line. Now if Black's attacked rook moves, 26. B-Q2 and 27 . RxP gives White an overwhelming game. So Black decided to sacrifice the exchange.

# Chess Life 

Rea Hayes, founder of the Parkway (Cincinnati) Chess Club won the club tournament, concluded on December 27, with a 5-1 score that included draws against Bert Edwards and Jack Graves. Hayes previously tied for first in this event with Tom Lajcik, in 1960, but lost the playoff match. Veteran Lester Brand took second place in this year's championship with a $41 / 2-11 / 2$ score. Rufus Patrick was the director.

Karl Panzner (9-0) swept the field in the Gompers Park (Chicago) Class A tournament, concluded on December 28. Fred Bender, 6-3, was runner-up. The club's C tournament ended in a tie between Allan Geis and James Murray, both 8-1.

## RONNING WINS IN SEATTLE

Gerald Ronning, a pfc. at Fort Lewis, whose home is in Birmingham, Ala., made his first appearance in northwest chess and won the 1963 Washington Open, played in Seattle on January 5 and 6. Ronning's score of $51 / 2-1 / 2$ put him a half point ahead of second-place
Ivars Dalbergs, who lost their individual him a half point ahead of second-place
Ivars Dalbergs, who lost their individual encounter. Fred Nedell, 4 $1 / 2$, finished third in the 30 -player event.

The tournament, sponsored by the Washington Chess Federation and directed by Al Livingston, was composed of a USCF section and a reserve section. It marked the first time that the Washington Open was USCF-rated. both 8-1. and 6. Ronning's score of $51 / 2-1 / 2$ put

COLUMBIA'S MICHAEL VALVO seems satisfied with his game in this scene from the U.S. Intercollegiate. For the story of this record-smashing event, see p. 16.

William Addison (that name again!) rolled up a $7-1$ score to win the Santa Monica Open on December 1-9, ahead
of P. Quillen, Anthony Saidy, R. Jacobs and Irving Rivise. Saidy's third-place finish gave him the Santa Monica Club Championship Trophy. Herbert T. Abel was the director.

Edward Stepans, Sven Almgren, M. Gordon, and Saul Yarmak qualified for the master section of the Herman Steiner Chess Club championship by finishing in that order in a 28 -player Swiss held from November 23 to December 26.

An open tournament for Westchester, Bronx, and Manhattan (N.Y.C.) students, both high school and college, will be held on February 23, 24 and March 2, 3 at the Mosholu-Montefiorre Community Center, 3450 DeKalb Ave., Bronx 67, N.Y. Those interested may contact Dr. Rubin C. Slater in care of the above address.

In Denver, Colorado, Robert Shean ran up a perfect $6-0$ score to take first place in the Central Bank and Trust Company's rating and handicap tournament, concluded on November 30. Forty players competed in the Friday evening Swiss, with Monty Mir Hosseini finishing second (5) and George Fritts ( $41 / 2$ ) third. The Colorado State Chess Association sponsored the event and Al Wallace directed.


## USCF Membership Meeting

## Gunter Hotel, San Antonio, August 15, 1962

The meeting was called to order by President Fred Cramer at 2 p.m. in the South Terrace Room. There were 51 members present. Minutes of the previous meeting were approved as published in Chess Life, page 30. The following proxies were reported: Morgan 5, Gardner 4, Christman 4, Brady 1.

## ELECTION OF DIRECTORS

The following were named Directors for 1962-1963: (one star denotes Officer-Director; two stars denote Life Director. Numerals after name of state indicate number of State Directors to which it is entitled, based on its membership.)

## REGION I

MAINE-1
Harlow B. Daly, Country Club Rd., Sanford NEW HAMPSHIRE-1

George P. Bart, 36 Dunklee St., Concord
VERMONT-0
MASSACHUSETTS-5
James A. Burgess*, 329 Adams St., Dorchester 22, Mass.
Eli Bourdon*, 1195 Hampden St., Holyoke, Mass.
Emil Reubens, 66 Morse St., Sharon, Mass.
Frederick J. Trayers, 8 Barton St., Salem, Mass.
Henry E. Rock, Hinsdale R.D., Beckett, Mass.
Harold Dandis, c/o 329 Adams St., Dorchester 22
Robert Goodspeed, 245 Park St., Stoughton, Mass.
RHODE ISLAND-1
Walter Suesman, 4 Mawney St., Providence 7
CONNECTICUT-3
William H. C. Newberry*, 233 Elm St., West Haven 16
Dr. Joseph Platz, 759 Main St., East Hartford 8
James Bolton, 249 Highland St., New Haven 11
Elliott S. Wolk, Apt. 34, South Campus, Storrs
REGION II
NEW YORK-16
Hermann Helms**, 150 Nassau St., New York 7 Maurice J. Kasper**, 530 Park Av., New York City
Caroline D. Marshall**, 23 W. 10th St., New York 11
Anthony E. Santasiere **, 620 Trinity Av., New York 55
Paul Giers**, 16 Ely Drive, Fayetteville
Harold M. Phillips**, 258 Broadway, New York City
Allen Kaufman*, 22-14 150th St., Whitestone 57
David Hoffman*, 165 Broadway, New York 6
William Slater, 116 Pinehurst Av., New York 33
Kathryn Slater, 116 Pinehurst Av., New York 33
Dr. Erich Marchand, 192 Seville Dr., Rochester 17
Dr. Bruno Schmidt, 15 Cayuga St., Homer, N.Y
Mitchell Saltzberg, 336 Ft. Washington Av., Apt. 3G, New York 33 Arthur Bisguier, 84-25 Elmhurst Av., Elmhurst 73
Harvey Weinstein, 332 Rogers Av., Brooklyn 25
Pal Benko, 1425 Third Av., New York 28
Dr. Karl Burger, 781 Linden Blvd., Brooklyn 3
Norman Wilder, 217 Elmwood Av., Buffalo
Jack Stuppler, 2680 E. 19th St., Brooklyn 35
Robert L. Labelle, Route 1, Phelps
John W. Collins, 521 E. 14th St., Apt. 36, New York 9 William Lombardy, 1600 University Av., Bronx 53, N.Y. Donald Schultz, Kingston, N.Y.
Julius Goldsmith, 63-88 Wetherole St., Rego Park 74


PRESIDENT FRED CRAMER making his report at the San Antonio meeting. USCF Secretary Marshall Rohland takes notes.

NEW JERSEY-6
E. Forry Laucks**, 30 Collamore Terrace, West Orange Charles Keyser*, 55 Laurel Av., Bloomfield
Leroy Dubeck, 6 Lee Court, Maplewood
Louis Levy, 77-16th Av., Paterson
William Lukowiak, 631 Mill St., Belleville
Henry Overeem, 148 Clinton Av., Clifton
Orest Popovych, 140 Estelle Lane, Lakewood
Lewis Wood, 1425 Sycamore St., Haddon Heights
PENNSYLVANIA-8
William Byland*, 1610 Bigelow Apts., Pittsburgh 19 Mordecai D. Treblow*, 434 West St., Bloomsburg Thomas Gutekunst, 1463 S. Jefferson St., Allentown Dr. Robert Bernreuter, Harris Acres R.D., State College Walter Fraser, 9 Cherry St., Willow Grove
Anthony S. Cantone, 1503 Mifflin St., Philadelphia Edward Strehle, 3480 Emerald St., Philadelphia 34 Earl Clary, 835 Lindsay Road, Carnegie
J. Elwood Armstrong, 49 Churchill Rd., Pittsburgh 35

Terrence L. Garmon, 507 Sickles St., Pittsburgh 21
MARYLAND-3
William C. Koenig, 810 Braeside Rd., Baltimore 29
Lewis A. Hucks, 2972 Cornwall Rd., Baltimore 22
William R. Bundick, 11 Aylesbury Rd., Timonium
VIRGINIA-3
Col. John B. Matheson*, 1512 N. Highland St., Arlington 1
Dr. Eliot Hearst, Arlington Towers, J-1125, Arlington 2
Charles W. Rider, 5902 Appleton Drive, Norfolk 2 H. Allen Smith, 104 Madison Lane N., Newport News DELAWARE-0
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA-2
George E. O'Rourke, 4430 Garrison St. NW, Washington 16, D.C. Andrew F. Downey, Jr., 1432 N. Nash, Apt. 8, Arlington 9, Va.
WEST VIRGINIA-1
Paul Sayre, 1033-14th St., Huntington 1, W. Va.
REGION IV
NORTH CAROLINA-2
Dr. Stuart Noblin*, 805 Yarmouth Rd., Raleigh
Dr. Norman M. Hornstein, Southport, N. Car,
Albert T. Pearson, 313 Plantation Place, Charlotte
SOUTH CAROLINA- 1
Prof. Laneau L. Fosier*, 1704 Green St., Columbia
Vacancy, (Director to be named later)
GEORGIA-1
M. H. Davis, 1805 N. Emory Rd. N.E., Atlanta

FLORIDA-3
Thomas R. Lucas, 114 Granada Ct., Orlando
Charles B. Stallings, 114 Granada Ct., Orlando
Stephen Raskin, 8160 N.W. 5th Av., Miami
KENTUCKY-1
William Seay, 1636 S. Limestone St., Lexington
TENNESSEE-2
Joseph Sullivan, Jr.*, 230 N. Purdue, Apt. 102, Oak Ridge
Peter Lahde, 80 Lyle Lane, Nashville 11
Hunter L. Weaks, 705 S. E. Graham St., Memphis ALABAMA-2

Fred W. Kemp, 114 N. Valley Rd., Palmerdale
Vacancy, (Director to be named later)
MISSISSIPPI-1
C. Troy Miller, Box 431, Natchez

REGION V
MICHIGAN-6
Jack O'Keefe*, 1905 Cambridge Rd., Ann Arbor
Dr. Howard V. Gaba*, 17328 Ohio, Detroit 21
Thomas Jenkins, 26409 York Rd., Huntington Woods
Paul Ligtvoet, 124 Montrose, Kalamazoo
Gary Abram, 18445 Ilene, Detroit 21
Fred Morningstar, 4465 Major, Drayton Plains
Edward I. Treend, 12203 Archdale, Detroit 27
Lucille Kellner, 17566 Santa Rosa Drive, Detroit 21
INDIANA-2
William Trinks, 2714 Cleveland St., Hammond
C. Ronald Peffley, 3714 Lori Lane, Indianapolis 24 OHIO- 6

Dr. S. S. Keeney**, 4153 W. 157th St., Cleveland 35 F. W. Bauer*, 4467 Kitridge Rd., Dayton

Rea Hayes, 820 Woodbine Av., Glendale, Ohio
Elliott Stearns, 1242 Union Commerce Bldg., Cleveland
Alfred Wellman, 2051 Summer St., Youngstown
Ervin Underwood, 1322 Wyandotte, Columbus
Harold Snyder, 108 Brehl Av., Columbus
Malcolm Patrick, 96 Gould Av., Bedford

## REGION VI

WISCONSIN-4
Arpad E. Elo**, 3935 N. Fiebrantz Dr., Brookfield
Fred Cramer*, 2422 E. Bradford Av., Milwaukee 11
Marshall Rohland ${ }^{*}$, 4846 N. 24th Place, Milwaukee 9
Ernest Olfe, 923 N. Market St., Milwaukee 2
Russell Kime, 520 West Blyd., Racine
Dr. J. Henry Hoffmann, Hoffmann House, Boscobel
Eugene G. Zastrow, 8064 N. 62 nd St., Milwaukee
ILLINOIS-7
Lewis J. Isaacs**, 2955 W. Coyle Av., Chicago 45
Elbert E. Wagner, Jr.**, 10817 Longwood Dr., Chicago 43
Eva Aronson*, 4058 Oketo Av., Chicago 34
Frank Skoff", 4833 N. Avers Av., Chicago 25
James Brotsos, 4810 W. Roscoe, Chicago

Gordon Dunham, 5421 Woodlawn, Chicago
Richard Verber, 2725 W. 84th St., Chicago 52
James Warren, 2257 S. Desplaines Av., North Riverside, III
Delores Herzog, 1043 Pleasant St., Oak Park
Peter Wolf, 6435 N. Damen Av., Chicago
Charles C. Brokaski, 3222 Sunnyside Av., Brookfield, Ill.
MINNESOTA-3
Dr. George Van Dyke Tiers", 165 S. Cleveland, St. Paul 5
George S. Barnes, 3001 Overlook Dr., Minneapolis 20
D. B. Terrell, 1933 Humboldt Av. So., Minneapolis 5

Eugene Hoeflin, 1057 Selby Av., St. Paul 4
IOWA-2
Kenneth Grant, 1735 Seminole Av., NW, Cedar Rapids
John Osness, 606 Longfellow Av., Waterloo
NORTH DAKOTA-0

## SOUTH DAKOTA-1

M. F. Anderson, P. O. Box 1466, Rapid City, S. Dak. NEBRASKA-1

Rev. Howard Ohman, 5016 Dodge, Omaha MONTANA-1

Dr. Peter Lapiken, Montana State College, Missoula WYOMING-0
MISSOURI-2
John Beitling ${ }^{\text {, }} 3533$ Genesee St., Kansas City 11, Mo.
Siegfried Langer, 4080 Concordia, St. Louis 16
David Edwards, 5753 Delor St., St. Louis 9 ARKANSAS- 1
F. W. Pratt, Majestic Hotel, Hot Springs LOUISIANA-2
A. Wyatt Jones**, P. O. Box 202, Shreveport
A. L. McAuley, 4225 S. Liberty St., New Orleans 15

Vacancy (Director to be named later)
KANSAS-1
Donald H. Seifert, 3022 Cissna St., Kansas City 4, Kans. OKLAHOMA-1

Jerry Spann ${ }^{*}$, 3011 Paseo, Oklahoma City 19
Robert Virgin, 2716 S. Robinson, Oklahoma City 9
TEXAS-5
C. Harold Bone*, 108 W. Bayshore Dr., Baytown

Larry Tracy, 2909 Hollandale Lane, Dallas
Dan Denney, 2201 N. Henderson, Dallas
William Wells, 410 S. Audobon, San Antonio
Rhodes Cook, 1913 W. McKinney, Houston
Park Bishop, P. O. Box 1416, El Paso
COLORADO-3
Dr, J. J. Reid ${ }^{\bullet}$, Colorado College, Colorado Springs
Dr. George Pipiringos, 1821 S. Java Way, Denver 19
Dennis G. Naylin, 700 E. Ellsworth, Apt. 1, Denver 9
Al Wallace, 646 S. Shoshone, Denver 23, Colo. NEW MEXICO-2

Sidney H. Brower, 2473B 36th St., Los Alamos, N. Mex.
Donald Wilson, 724 Washington NE, Albuquerque

## REGION VIII

WASHINGTON-2
Max Mage, 2437-55th S.W., Seattle 5
Don Liljenquist, 934 N. Elder, Tacoma 6

## OREGON-1

Donald H. Turner, 610 E. 20th, The Dalles
CALIFORNIA-16
Isaac Kashdan**, 834 Wooster St., Los Angeles 35
Harry Borochow**, 6363 Wilshire Blvd., Los Angeles 48
George Koltanowski*", 3049 Laguna St., San Francisco 23
Maj. Edmund B. Edmondson ${ }^{*}$, 210 Britton Way, Mather AFB
Henry Gross*, 3544 Webster St., San Francisco 23
Herbert T. Abel, 126 Bicknell Av., Santa Monica
Vitaley Radaikin, 763 Arguello Blvd., San Francisco
Gordon S. Barrett, 1744 Redesdale Av., Los Angeles 26
Kyle Forrest, 853 - 27th St., Manhattan Beach
Newton Grant, 4269 Taos Dr., San Diego 17
Don Moran, 2951 Mandeville Canyon Rd., Los Angeles 44
Guthrie McClain, 244 Kearny St., San Francisco
Mrs. Gregor Piatigorsky, 400 S. Bundy Dr., Los Angeles 49
Irving Rivise, 4050 W . Slauson Av., Los Angeles 43
Nathan Robinson, 3618 Carmona Av., Apt. D, Los Angeles 16
Dr. Philip D. Smith, 1331 W. Robinson St., Fresno 5
Alan Troy, 3645 Kelton St., East Los Angeles
Spencer Van Gelder, 2735 Larkin St., San Francisco 9
Neal Austin, 1608-42nd St., Sacramento 19
Dr. Alex Janushkowsky, 4405 Stockton Blvd., Sacramento 25
Sven Almgren, 464 N. Ogden Dr., Los Angeles 36
IDAHO-1
Richard S. Vandenburg*, 2316 Regan Av., Bolse
Vacancy (Director to be named later.)
NEVADA-1
Kenneth Jones, 1664 California Av., Reno
UTAH-1
Gaston Chappuis, 157 B St., Salt Lake City 3
ARIZONA-3
Mabel Burlingame*, 3310 E. Roosevelt St., Phoenix 8
James Christman, 1425 E. Thornwood Dr., Scottsdale
A. Max Gardner, 215 W. Campbell Av., Phoenix 13

Charles Morgan, 2238 E. McDowell, Lot C-65, Phoenix 6
Anthony W. Schultz, Box 5-584, Mt. View Branch, Anchorage HAWAII-0

## REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

President Cramer pointed out the progress USCF has made in the last few years. Especially interesting was the contrast between the standing of the USCF at the 1952 U. S. Open in Tampa- 1100 members, $\$ 5000$ debt-and the standing of the USCF at the present 1962 U. S. Open in San Antonio- 6300 members, no debt.

Mr. Cramer distributed a Financial Statement, and discussed changes in assets and liabilities. The members' attention was directed to the difference between the first six months and the last six months of the year's Financial Statement. The difference was attributed to the contrast in policies between the old Business Manager and the new Business Manager. The previous Business Manager followed a policy of vast undertakings with accordingly vast expenditures. While these vast expenditures helped to increase membership, they forced USCF into extravagant channels, which did financial damage. From August to December, 1961, USCF lost $\$ 600$ per month. This would not have happened with a sound financial policy. Since Joseph Reinhardt became Business Manager in December, he has run the Business Office in a "bread and butter" manner and has kept expenses down. It was noted that income from tournament entry fees had gone down. It was noted that many tournaments can be best operated by USCF affiliates, rather than by the USCF itself. Though these entry fees provided revenue, USCF expenses to run these tournaments proved greater, and consequently, USCF had actually saved money by not running these tournaments itself.

Below is the detailed statement comparing USCF business operations in the first six months of the year ended $6-30-62$ with the operations in the last six months of the year, after the change of Business Managers.

|  | Six Months <br> Ended | Six Months <br> Ended |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Income |  |  |

Mr. Cramer stated that though USCF was operating at a profit, it would be unwise to undertake beneficient projects, and warned against overoptimism. It was emphasized that the membership campaign and book and equipment sales picture had allowed USCF to show this profit.

Mr. Treblow (Pa.) and Dr. Marchand (NY) inquired about certain items on the Financial Statement such as Office Salaries and Business Manager's Salary and Commissions. Mr. Cramer explained that there is no longer a commission arrangement with the Business Manager, for he is now on a straight salary. This is necessary for USCF to gain a position for tax deductibility.

## REPORT OF NATIONAL VICE-PRESIDENT

Major Edmund Edmondson reported favorably on the Handicap System with which he had been experimenting. Much statistical work has been done, and many new good suggestions have been made. Several clubs have already utilized the Handicap System.

Major Edmondson reported that he had explored a possible tiein with the junior Chamber of Commerce to support Junior Chess activity,

## REPORTS OF REGIONAL VICE-PRESIDENTS

REGION I. In a submitted report, Vice-President Newberry (Conn) described increased chess promotional activity in Connecticut and Maine. Mr. Newberry reported that some Connecticut USCF members had recommended USCF raise its dues for adults, and lower dues for Juniors.

REGION II. The Region II report, submitted in writing by VicePresident Charles Keyser (NJ), described vast activity. Many clubs and leagues in New York City were enumerated.

The New York State Chess Association sponsors its State Championship, in Poughkeepsie in 1962, and the New York State Amateur, in Geneva. Upstate activities include the Lake Ontario Open at Rochester and the very successful $30-30$ U. S. Championship sponsored
by the Poughkeepsie club. In the four counties around Geneva, the Fifth Annual Geneva Scholastic Championship was held, and the new eight-team Hudson Valley Chess League was formed.
The New Jersey State Chess Federation annually sponsors its New Jersey Open, and maintains its N. J. Junior Travel Fund. The New Jersey Amateur Tournament is held annually in Camden, and three huge leagues operate in New Jersey.

REGION III. The Region III report was given by Mordecai Treblow (Pa) who reported 390 members in Pennsylvania with eighteen clubs affiliated. Intercollegiate Chess has boomed in Pennsylvania, and accounts for a fifth of the State's USCF membership. Mr. Treblow praised Vice-President William Byland whose promotional work in Pittsburgh has been outstanding.

REGION IV. The Region IV report submitted by Vice-President Dr. Stuart Noblin (N.Car) told of steady chess promotion with twentysix tournaments during the year in the region. Region IV issued a challenge to Region I for total members and affiliates next year.

REGION V. The Region $V$ report was given by Vice-President Jack O'Keefe (Mich) who told of a steady rise in USCF membership in Michigan and Ohio. Chess activity in Indiana has not yet fulfilled expectations.

REGION VI. The Region VI report, given by Vice-President Eva Aronson, commended Wisconsin for its two huge regional tournaments. The major development in Region VI, however, was the creation of the Illinois State Chess Association. The ISCA is USCF affiliated, and has been remarkably active. Vice-President George Tlers gave a glowing account of chess activity in Minnesota.

## OLD BUSINESS

Mr. Radaikin (Calif) asked whether the present U.S. Open Tournament would have handicap prizes. Maj. Edmondson stated that the handicap system was being applied, and that the computations could be completed before the victory banquet.

## NEW BUSINESS

A resolution submitted by Jasper Burrus of Klamath, Calif. was outlined to the members by President Cramer. The Burrus resolution cailed for an extensive reorganization of USCF both as to its administration and its player rating and qualifications. The members felt that the resolution required the USCF to infringe upon local organizers, and would require the USCF to be responsible for motions which it could not enact. Mr. Cramer referred the matter to the By-Laws Committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,
MARSHALL ROHLAND
Secretary, USCF

# FRENCH WOOD CHESSMEN 

- HAND-CARVED
- VARNISHED
- WEIGHTED

FELTED

These are chess pieces of world-wide renown and popularity, made of seasoned boxwood in the STAUNTON design. Their perfect balance and fine, hand-carved detail make them a favorite with chess players everywhere

|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Unit } \\ & \text { Price } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \text { to } \\ & 12 \text { sets } \end{aligned}$ | More than 12 sets |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | 2F........King 23/4" | High....\$ 5.50 | \$ 5.25 ea. | \$ 5.00 each |
| No. | 4F........King $31 / 4{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | High.... 6.85 | 6.50 ea. | 6.00 each |
| No. | 6F........King 33/4" | High.... 8.75 | 8.40 ea. | 8.00 each |
| No. | 8F........King 4¼" | High.... 11.50 | 11.00 ea. | 10.50 each |
| No. | 10F........King 43/4" | High.... 16.95 | 16.20 ea. | 15.50 each |

## Mail your order to

## UNITED STATES CHESS FEDERATION

80 East 11th Street, New York 3, N.Y.

No. 10F........King 43/4" High.... 16.95

# TOURNAMENT AND CLUB EQUIPMENT FOR U.S.C.F. AFFILIATES 



> SWISS PAIRING CARD

Official USCF card for Swiss System tournaments. Simplifies pairings by ratings, calculation of tiebreaking points, etc. Size $5^{\prime \prime} \times 8^{\prime \prime}$.
No. US-14; $\$ 3.50$ per 100 less $21 \%$ to USCF members.

$$
\text { ............... } \$ 2.77 \text { per } 100
$$

## MIDGET SCORE BOOK

Measures only $33 / 4^{\prime \prime} \times 6{ }^{11 / 4}$ ". Spiralbound in pressboard covers, it takes up less room than a looseleaf binder for the same size of sheet. More practical and saves cost of binder. Lies flat on table, provides solid writing surface. Contains sheets for 40 games with ruled spaces for 60 moves and diagram blank, $21 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ square, for each game.
No. US. 10 : $\mathbf{6 0} \mathrm{c}$ less $\mathbf{2 0 \%}$ to USCF members ...............................48c
$\$ 5.00$ per dozen

## SEALED MOVE ENVELOPE

Official USCF envelope for score sheet with sealed move of adjourned game. 21/2" diagram blank. Spaces for move number, players' names, time consumed, etc. Size $31 / 2^{\prime \prime} \times 61 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ with gummed flap.

No. US-16: $\$ 3.50$ per 100 less $21 \%$ to USCF members.... $\$ 2.77$

## GAME SCORE PAD

Pad of 60 official game score sheets $6^{\prime \prime} \times 9^{\prime \prime}$, ruled for 60 moves. Heavy bond paper. Cardboard backing.
No. US-12: 60 c less $\mathbf{2 0 \%}$ to USCF members. 48c

## $\$ 4.50$ per dozen

## LIFETIME TOURNAMENT BOARD ROLL-UP FOLD-UP

Made of washable vinyl, this board can be carried in your pocket, in your chess set box or virtually anywhere. Overall size $20^{\prime \prime} \times 20^{\prime \prime}$ with $2^{1 / 4^{\prime \prime}}$ squares. Green and maple. A bargain at only.
$\$ 2.00$

## TOURNAMENT BOARD <br> $201 / 4^{\prime \prime} \times 201 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ with $21 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ squares

This board is used in nationally important chess events as well as by many leading chess clubs for regular play or for tournaments. Designed by chessplayers for maximum visibility and minimum strain on the eyes. Green and buff squares. Printed on heavy paper.
No. 46-\$3.50 less $15 \%$ to USCF members
$\mathbf{\$ 2 . 9 8}$ per dozen

## SWISS TOURNAMENT RESULTS CHART

For posting names, ratings, progressive scores, colors, tiebreaking points, final rank. Printed on heavy paper, $18 \frac{1 / 2 \prime \prime}{} \mathrm{x}$ $121 / 2^{\prime \prime}$. Can be trimmed with scissors to combine charts for any number of players and number of rounds.
No. US-18- $\$ 1.25$ per doz. less $20 \%$ to USCF members $\$ 1.00$ per dozen

## GELLER-

(Continued from page 20)
25. ........
$\mathbf{R x B}$
26. Nx R
BxP

Black is desperate and gives White the chance to enter with his QR. In any case, White has a winning position: Black has weak pawns and his KB is out of the game. Black still can't defend his QBP by $\qquad$ B-Q1 because of $\mathbf{P}$ KB4, and meanwhile White can further improve the position of his pieces by B-R5 or N-R5.
27. B-Q2
Q-R5
28. $R \times P$
........

Black's game is hopeless now.
28.
K-N2
29. N-R5
B-QN4
30. Q-QR3
........

White has a forced win this way. 30. Q-KB3 is less convincing because of 30 . ........, R-KB1 and ........, B-Q1.
30. ........
31. N-B6
B-K2
B-B1
$\qquad$

Or 31. ........, BxN; 32. PxB and the passed pawn is too strong.

## 32. B-N4 N-B3

Or 32. Q-B3; 33. R-K3 and Black can't defend all his weak points.

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
\text { 33. } \mathrm{BxP} & \text { N } \times K P \\
\text { 34. } \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P} \text { ch } & \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N1} \\
\text { 35. } Q \cdot \mathrm{~KB} 3 & \mathrm{P} \cdot \mathrm{~B} 4
\end{array}
$$

At last Black plays the move for which he has been trying for the whole middle game; but that's as far as he gets.

## 36. P-Q6 Resigns

White threatened 37 . Q-N3 mate. If 36. ........, B-B5; 37. N-K7 ch, BxN; 38. $\mathrm{RxB}(\mathrm{B} 4)$ and wins because of the threat of $39 . \mathrm{R}(\mathrm{B} 4) \mathrm{xN}$.

A game with an instructive feature; it illustrates how, in chess, you can utilize tactical points to further your strategic plans.

## COLLINS-

(Continued from page 19)
12. ........
Q-K2
13. P-QB4
QxBP
15. B-N2
16. B-B2
B-K3
14. PxP QxQP

Preferable is 16.
QR-Q1. But if 16. ........, Q-B4; 17. N-Q4, P-B5??; 18. NxB, QxP ch; 19. R-B2, QxN; 20. B-N3 wins.

## 17. $K R x Q$

White has emerged with the advantage of the combined Bishops for the ending.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 17. ...... } & \text { KR-Q1 } \\
\text { 18. K-B2 } & \text { K-B2? }
\end{array}
$$

This cedes White another Bishop or a passed Pawn. It seems 18. $\qquad$ P-KN3, followed by ........, B-B5 and $\qquad$ P-QN4, is the proper course.

|  | 19. P-R3 | N-B3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| If 19. | ..., P-KN3; | 20. P-N4. |
|  | 20. N-B4 | P-KN3 |
|  | 21. P-N4 | RxR |
|  | 22. RxR | R-Q1 |

Black side-steps isolated K-side Pawns with 22. ........, PxP, but gives White a passed KP.
23. NxB
KxN
26. PxP
24. B-N3ch K-K2
27. K-N3
PxP
25. $R \times R$
$\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{R}$


Position after 27. K-N3

With his better King position and two Bishops, White has a win.
27.
$\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 3$
28. B-B2
$\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{R} 4 \mathrm{ch}$
N/4-N2

As usual in such endings, the Knights are forced back.
30. BxN

One Bishop is returned to get the King further in and win the BP and/or the KRP.

| 30. ....... | NxB |
| :--- | ---: |
| 31. K-N5 | K-K3 |
| 32. P-B4 | ........ |

Or 32. K-R6.
32. .
P.N4
33. P-KR4
P.QR4

A flicker of hope with a passed NP.

| 34. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 3 \mathrm{ch}$ | K-K2 | 38. B-R2 | P-N5 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 35. P-R5 | P-R3ch | 39. PxP | PxP |
| 36. K-N6 | N-K3 | 40. K-N6 | P-N6 |
| 37. KxBP | N-B4 | 41. B-N1 | N-K3 |

If 41. ......... N-R5; 42. K-N7, N-B6; 43. B-Q3, P-N7; 44. P-B5, P-N8=Q; 45. BxQ, NxB; 46. P-B6 ch wins.

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { P.B5 } \\ & \text { P.B6 ch } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} \cdot \mathrm{Q} 1 \\ & \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 3 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| If 43. ........, K-B1; 44. KxP soon |  |  |  |
| 44. B-Q3 | P-N7 | 47. P-B7 | K-Q3 |
| 45. B-B4ch | K-K4 | 48. KxP | K-K2 |
| 46. B-R2 | N-K3 | 49. K-N6 | N-Q1 |
| If 49.. | -B1 | 0. K-N7 | 3 | 51. K-N8 wins.

50. K-N7
NxP
5.1. P-R6


Not 51. BxN???, P-N8=Q and Black wins.

| 51. |  | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 4$ | 54. B-N1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 52. P -R7 | N 4 | $\mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | 55. K 4 |
| 53. | R4 | Resigns |  |

An impressive, rewarding effort by Shapiro.

## ONCE IN A LIFETIME OFFER . . . !

The tragic death of Master Glenn E. Hartleb revealed chess debts which that honest person surely would have paid. The obligations will be met by an extraordinary sale of a chess book at less than cost of printing.

The deceased, once Membership Secretary, USCF, wrote in his final six years, a book, reputed to be an excellent one. "Selected End Games," Hartleb \& N. T. Whitaker, a mine of information, 365 endings, large diagrams; much of the writing original and not to be found elsewhere.

It has been selling around Europe at $\$ 3.60$ ( $\$ 4.45$ in Germany-17.80 Deutsche Marks); but those remaining will be sacrificed at $\$ 1.60$ postpaid! In lofs of 5 , ideal for club prizes, only $\$ 1.35$ each. An attractive present.

You may know all about endings, perhaps the most difficult part of the game. Dozens of examples are given of errors by the world's greatest Masters; how champions went astray because they failed in endings! Hartleb used care in his selection; and used to say with pride, "There is not a lemon in the bunch!"
(a) Do you know 3 positions which are wins but require more than 50 moves? (b) What do you do before the count of 50 ? (c) After completing 50 moves what steps do you take? (d) Can you set up any of said 3 endings? A deep student might find additional positions!

How many books have been written on endings? 31, 95 or 300 ? The libraries of the world have been searched. A list of about 300 is given from many languages. Some chess lovers have bought the book just to get these titles.

All copies should soon be sold; no reprint will be made. The supply is limited. Send for your copy today; $\$ 1.60$ check or money order to:

> FRIENDS OF HARTLEB
> 3237 M St., N.W.,
> Washington 7, D. C.

# 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 or 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 compare your total with those which various USCF ranking groups are expected to make.

You have Black. Your consultation partner is USCF Expert Dr. Wolf Wolfensberger. Your opponent is Paul Keres, famous Soviet grandmaster. The game was played in a recent exhibition by Keres in London. Dr. Wolfensberger, a 28 -year-old graduate of Peabody College, Nashville, Tennessee, is at present working on a U.S. Public Health postdoctoral research Fellowship at Maudsley Hospital, London. Could you play as well as he does in an exhibition game against one of the top players in the world? Could you have beaten the Soviet grandmaster?

## P. Keres <br> Dr. W. Wolfensberger

## RUY LOPEZ

The opening moves are 1. P-K4, P-K4; 2. N-KB3, N-QB3; 3. B-N5, P-QR3; 4. B-R4, P-Q3; 5. P-B3, P-B4; 6. PxP, BxP; 7. P-Q4,


From now on, try to work out Black's moves before uncovering them.
7. ........ P-K5

3 points. In defenses to the Lopez where Black plays an early ........, P-KB4, he has to make up for the weakness of his King's position either by a space
advantage in the centre or by a big lead in development. Hence, nothing for 7. $\qquad$ PxP?; 8. NxP when White has a strong initiative. Nothing for 7. P-QN4; 8. B-N3 which places White's bishop on a still stronger diagonal from where it can embarrass Black's efforts to castle KR. Nothing for 7. ........, N-B3 or 7. ........, B-K2, after which White can win at least a pawn by 8. P-Q5, P-QN4; 9. PxN, PxB; 10. QxRP.

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
\text { 8. } & \text { N-N5 } & \ldots \ldots . . \\
\text { 8. } & \text {........ } & \text { B-K2 }
\end{array}
$$

2 points for this or for 8. ........, P-Q4, the other move recommended by most opening books. Award yourself a bonus point if you noticed that after 8 .
P-R3 (no credit if you chose this move) White replies 9 . N-KR3!, BxN; 10. Q-R5 ch, followed by 11. QxB with a big advantage. Deduct a point if you chose 8. ........, N-B3? after which the reply 9 . Q-N3! threatening both Q-B7 mate and QxP wins almost out of hand. Award yourself a bonus point if you noticed this variation and chose a different move to 8. ........, N-B3.

Award yourself a bonus point if, whether or not you chose to play it, you noticed that 8. ........., B-K2 does not threaten to win a piece because White can simply reply 9 . o.O and if 9 . BxN; 10. Q-R5 check and 11. QxB. Award yourself a further bonus point if you chose 8. ........, B-K2 and noticed that 9. O-O (which is the book refutation) can be strongly met by 9 ........., P-Q4! after which it is not easy for White to demonstrate an advantage.

A bonus point also for working out the variation 8. ........, B-K2; 9. P-Q5, BxN; 10. Q -R5 ch, P-N3; 11. QxB, QxQ; 12 . BxQ, P-N4; and for deciding that Black then stands reasonably well.

## 9. Q-N3

9. ........

## BxN

1 point for this; deduct a point if you chose any other move, after which White would win easily by $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 7$ ch or QxP.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 10. } \mathrm{BxB} \quad \text { QxB } \\
& \text { 10. ............ }
\end{aligned}
$$

1 point; no credit for anything else.
11. QxP
11. ...... Q-B8 ch

1 point. No credit for 11. ........, QxP? 12. QxR ch, K-B2; 13. R-B1, B-R6; 14. QxP and White should win. Award yourself a bonus point if you had worked out, before making Black's 11th move, that if $11 . \ldots \ldots . ., \mathrm{Q}$-B8 ch; 12 . B-Q1, R-N1! 13. QxN ch, K-Q1 should win for Black because of the unanswerable threat of ........, QxNP and ........, QxR.

## 12. K-K2

12. ........
Q×R

1 point.
13. $Q \times R$ ch
13. ........ K-B2
2 points. The king is best placed here, since if 13. ........., K-Q2? (no credit); 14. QxN ch gains an important tempo while 13. useful square from Black's KN.


## 14. B-N3ch?

Award yourself a bonus point if you had decided that 14. QxQN is White's best continuation. Give yourself a further two bonus points if you had seen the gist of the continuation 14. N-B3; 15. QxP ch, K-N3; 16. P-KR3!, Qx NP; 17. QxP, Q-B6ch; 18. K-K1, Q-R8 ch; 19. K-K2 (not 19. K-Q2?, P-K6 ch!), which should be best play for both sides and to lead to a draw by perpetual check.
14.
14. ........

K-N3
1 point. Again other squares are much inferior, since Black wants to reserve K2 and KB3 for his knight. Deduct a point for 14. ........, B-K3?; 15. P-Q5.
15. QXQN
15. ........ $\quad$ N-B3

2 points. 1 point for 15. ........, N-R3 or 15. ......... B-N5 ch which should win, though not so clearly as the text. Nothing for 15. ........, N-K2; 16. QxBP, when Black's knight is on an inferior square. Nothing for 15 ........., QxNP or 15. ........, QxRP when White plays 16 . N-Q2 and is out of trouble.

> 16. QxBP
> 16. .......

B-N5ch

## THE BRITISH CHESS MAGAZINE

The oldest chess periodical in the English Language (monthly, non-stop, since 1881).

## Order direct from:

> The British Chess Magazine 20 Chestnut Road, West Norwood, London, S.E. 27. Great Britain.

> Subscription Rates
> 12 months: $\$ 4.30$
> 36 months: $\$ 12.00$
> A special Air Mail Edition is available at $\$ 6.00$.

[^0]2 points. As we shall see, this is now clearly stronger than 16 . ........, QxNP or 16. ........, R-K1 or 16. ........, R-QB1, for all of which no credit.
17. K-Q2
(If $17 . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{QxP}$ ch should win, while if 17. K-K3, Q-K8 ch; 18. K-B4, QxP mate.
17. ........

## P-K6ch!

4 points for this; nothing for anything else.

## 18. $K \times P$

(No better is 18. PxP, QxP ch; and if $19 . \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 3, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 7$ mate, or $19 . \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{Q}$ B8 ch; 20. K-Q2, Q-K7 ch; 21. K-B1, Q-K8 ch; 22. K-B2, Q-Q8 mate. 3 bonus points for working out this variation before deciding on your 17th move).

## 18.

........

## Q-K8ch

2 points for this move, which gives you the thrill of seeing the Soviet grandmaster turn over his king in resignation. If now 19. K-Q3, Q-K7 mate; or 19. KB4, QxP mate.

## 19. Resigns

## SCORE ANALYSIS

31-34-USCF Senior Master or Master Strength
27-30-Expert Strength
23-26-Class A Strength
18-22-Class B Strength
14.17-Class C Strength

11-16-With more practice in your local chess club, you should reach match play standard
Below 10-Beginner or new-beginner.


## DELUXE TRAVELLING CHESS SET

This peg-in set has a big playing board 8 inches square! Plastic pieces are $3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ high (see photo at right for actual size of King). De Luxe model, shown above, has leatherette case with spaces for captured men and padded cover to keep pieces in position.

No. 903-De Luxe Travelling Chess Set, as illustrated:
$\$ 7.00$ less $10 \%$ to USCF members.
\$6.30

Mail your order to
UNITED STATES CHESS FEDERATION
80 East 11th Street, New York 3, N.Y.
All prices include postage and shipping charges in U.S.A. N.Y.C. Residents: Add 3\% tax to all prices.
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## WINDSOR CASTLE

## Plastic Chessmen

THE WINDSOR CASTLE CHESS SET is the finest chess set available at such a moderate price. It is used exclusively in the U.S. Championship, U.S. Open, U.S. Amateur, etc., and is officially approved by the U.S. Chess Federation. This set is exactly the right size, weight and design for real chessplayers. Made of solid plastic that is practically indestructible even under the severest test, it is designed to last for years. Authentic Staunton design. King Height $4^{\prime \prime}$. Felts cemented permanently with special plastic glue. Loaded sets have big lead weights moulded into bases. Unloaded sets are much heavier than "weighted" chessmen made from plastic shells. Color is Black and Maple. Prices include handsome leatherette two compartment case. We pay all postage and handling costs.
No. 27 Black and Maple. Felted but unloaded set in leatherettecovered case, as illustrated.
Special bargain! $\$ 15.00$ less $30 \%$ to USCF members............ $\$ 10.50$
In half dozen lots without cases........................................ $\$ 7.95$ each
In dozen lots without cases........................................................ 7.50 each
No. 21 Black and Maple. Felted and heavily loaded set in leather-ette-covered case, as shown.
$\$ 20.00$ less $15 \%$ to USCF members.................................................................................. $\mathbf{1 2 5}$
In half dozen lots, without cases...........
In half dozen lots, without cases...................................... $\$ 12.75$ each
In dozen lots, without cases.. 12.00 each

No. 23 Black and Maple. Felted and heavily loaded set in leather-ette-covered de luxe case with individual felt-lined division for all pieces (not shown).
$\mathbf{\$ 2 5 . 0 0}$ less $\mathbf{2 1} \%$ to USCF members.

# TOURNAMENT LIFE 

## February 9 and 10

"ROUND UP" TOURNAMENT
Sponsored by Chess Friends of Northern California to be held at the Oakland YMCA, 2101 Telegraph Ave., Oakland, Calif. In two sections: one for money prizes, entry fee $\$ 10$ plus $\$ 2$ membership to Chess Friends, first prize at least $\$ 100$. Second section, entry fee $\$ 4$ plus $\$ 2$ membership to Chess Friends, many trophy and book prizes for all classes of players. Tournament Director: George Koltanowski. Entries \& details: Mrs. Juanita Eckert, 2216 Davis Drive, Burlingame, Calif.

## February $15-17$

## 3RD ANNUAL WESTCHESTER FIESTA

6 -round Swiss sponsored by Westchester Chess Club, to be played at Loyola University, 80th St. and Loyola Blvd., Los Angeles, Calif. Entry fee $\$ 10.50$ plus USCF membership. Minimum 1st prize $\$ 150$ and trophy; 2nd $\$ 75$; others. For details: Joe Kalivada, 6523 Firebrand St., Los Angeles 45, Calif.

## February 16 and 17 <br> GEORGIA STATE OPEN

5 round Swiss at Armed Services YMCA, 14 W. 11th St., Columbus, Ga. Register 8 a.m., play starts 9 a.m. Entry fee $\$ 5$ plus USCF membership. Guaranteed prizes: 1st $\$ 50$, 2nd $\$ 25$, 3rd $\$ 10$. Mail entry or address inquiries to: George H. Less, Box 5363, Columbus, Ga.

## February 16-17 \& 23-24

## GREATER PHILADELPHIA OPEN

8-round Swiss to be held at Mitten Hall, Temple Univ., Broad \& Montgomery, Philadelphia, Pa. Entry fee $\$ 5$ for USCF members; women and girls \$2. Cash prizes, including special women's prize, depending on number of contestants. Entries \& inquiries to: Ryum, 1023 E. Hortter St., Philadelphia 50, Pa.

## February 22-23-24 <br> USCF EUROPEAN MIDWINTER FESTIVAL

(13th USCF Rating Tournament)
6-round Swiss at the Garmisch Recreation Area Steak House, Garmisch, Germany. Open to all USCF members. $\$ 4.00$ entry fee-HANDICAP system will be used, with cash prizes for handicap scores and point scores dependent upon number of entries. Speed Tournament ( $\$ 1.00$ fee). For information write (via Air Mail) to Tournament Director, Captain Arthur C. Joy, Company B, 17th Signal Battalion, APO 164, New York, N.Y.

# February 22-23-24 <br> 66TH ANNUAL MINNESOTA STATE TOURNAMENT 

To be held at University of Minnesota, Minneapolis 14, Minn., in Coffman Memorial Union ballroom, in four sections: premier, major, minor, and Sunday (not rated). Premier section open to all USCF members, entry fee $\$ 7.00$ (Minnesota highschool or college students $\$ 5.00$ ) prizes: 1st $\$ 50$; 2nd $\$ 25$; 3rd $\$ 15$; 4th $\$ 10$. Top four Minnesota residents qualify for later Championship finals. Major section open to all USCF members who are not USCF masters or experts, entry fee $\$ 5$ (students $\$ 30$, prizes: cash \& trophies, top two qualify for finals. Minor section for unrated and Class C players. For entries and inquiries: Wm. R. Jones, 3539 Pierce St., N.E., Minneapolis 18, Minn. Bring chess sets and clocks.

## February 22-23-24 JUNIOR EASTERN OPEN CHAMPIONSHIP

To be held at Takoma Park Chess Club, Takoma Park, Md. Open to all USCF members 20 years six months of age or younger. 6-round Swiss; entry fee $\$ 3$ plus USCF membership. Trophy prizes for 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and classes. For further details contact Ivan Romanenko.

## February 22-24

FOURTH EL PASO OPEN
6 -round Swiss sponsored by Chess Club of El Paso to be held at Downtown Hilton Hotel, El Paso, Texas. Entry fee \$10; juniors under $18 \$ 5$ plus USCF membership. Guaranteed 1st prize $\$ 100$, 2nd $\$ 50$, 3rd $\$ 25$; other prizes and trophies in all classes. For details: Hector M. Fabela, 5904 Delta Drive, El Paso, Texas.

## February 23 and 24 <br> 3RD ANNUAL RIO GRANDE VALLEY OPEN

5-round Swiss sponsored by Harlingen Chess Club to be played at Cortez Hotel, Highway 83 \& Texas Blvd., Weslaco, Texas. Entry fee (if paid prior to Feb. 15) \$5. Make checks payable to Harlingen Chess Club. Minimum prize 1st place, $\$ 100$. All fees in excess of expenses divided as other cash prizes. Also trophies for 1st Class A, B, C \& Unrated. Entries and inquiries to: K. C. Mowry, 801 Sul Ross, Harlingen, Texas.

## February 23 and 24 GEM CITY OPEN

5 -round Swiss open to all USCF members to be held at Central YMCA, 117 W. Monument Ave., Dayton, Ohio. Registration begins 10 a.m., Sat., Feb. 23. Entry fee $\$ 6$. (advance entry fee $\$ 4.50$ if received by Feb. 20.) Send to: Don Blossom, 4108 Woodbine Ave., Dayton 20, Ohio. \$50 first prize guaranteed. Cash prizes for classes \& Junior (under 18)
plus special handicap prizes. Other prizes depending on size of entry. Please bring sets, boards, clocks, and proof of USCF membership.

## March I-3 <br> PENNSYLVANIA INDIVIDUAL INTERCOLLEGIATE

5-round Swiss restricted to Pennsylvania students enrolled in four year or junior colleges, to be held at Penn State, Hetzel Union Building, University, Pa . $\$ 3$ entry fee. Tournament director, Donald Byrne. For details: William F. Fuller, Hetzel U. Building, University Park, Pa.

March 2-3
SAN JACINTO OPEN
5-round Swiss to be held at Houston Chess Club, 1913 W. McKinney, Houston 19, Texas. S̄̄ entry fee, plus USCF membership and Texas Chess Assoc. membership. Prizes will be awarded according to size of entry. This will be T.C.A. candidate tournament for Region $V$ residents. For details: Rhodes Cook, 1913 W. McKinney, Houston 19, Texas.

## March 8-9-10 JACKSON OPEN

7-round Swiss sponsored by Capital City Chess Club, to be played at Robert E. Lee Hotel, North Lamar St., Jackson, Miss. $\$ 10$ entry fee for USCF members; $\$ 100$ prizes plus trophies for men, women. Entries and inquiries: John Poole, $4171 / 2$ E. Capitol St., Jackson, Miss.

## March 16-17 <br> PENN AMATEUR OPEN

Sponsored by the Greater Reading C. C., a 6 -round Swiss to be held at Central YMCA, Reed and Washington Sts., Reading, Pa. Open to all USCF members rated below 2000. $\$ 5$ entry fee; trophy prizes. Entries and inquiries: Frederick S. Townsend, 103 Halsey Ave., West Lawn, Pa.

## March 23-24 and 30-31 GREATER CHICAGO CITY CHAMPIONSHIP

8-round Swiss at Gompers Park, 4224 W. Foster, Chicago. Entry fee $\$ 10$ (Juniors under $19, \$ 5$ ). Mail entries and inquiries to Peter Wolf, 6435 N. Damen, Chicago 45, Illinois. Play starts 1 p.m., March 23. $\$ 600$ minimum prize fund.

> 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. 11 th St., New York 3 , N.Y.


[^0]:    Payments in US \$ bills, by International money order or by cheque (Add $\$ 0.40$ for collecting charges in this last case).

