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## WOMEN'S CHAMPIONSHIP STARTS APRIL 26

The Henry Hudson Hotel in New York City has been chosen as the site for the 1964 United States Women's Championship, with the first round scheduled to begin on Sunday afternoon, April 26, at 2 p.m. Twelve of the strongest women players in the country, selected according to their January 1st USCF ratings, will compete in the two-week-long round robin. Among those who will participate are defending champion Gisela K. Gresser, New York; Sonja Graf Stevenson, Cincinnati; Eva Aronson, St. Petersburg, Fla.; Mary Bain, New York; Jacqueline Piatigorsky, Los Angeles; Mildred Morrell, Somerdale, N.J.; Mary Selensky, Philadelphia; and Cecelia Rock, Hinsdale, Mass.

The playing sessions will be held in a large hotel suite and will be open to the public, admission $\$ 1.00$. Further details may be had from the USCF, 80 E. 11th St., New York 3, N.Y.

## STUDENTS TO COMPETE IN POLAND

A team of U.S. student players, to be captained by Grandmaster William Lombardy, is scheduled to compete in the XIth World Team Championship for Students at Cracow, Poland, from July 18 to August 2.

Mr. Lombardy, who has taken on the assignment of raising badly needed funds for this event, has announced receiving contributions and pledges amounting to several hundred dollars as a result of his initial volunteer activity. Much more money is needed, however, and USCF members are urged to send their contributions to

> William Lombardy 1600 University Ave. Bronx 53 , N.Y.

Your check or money order should be made out to "American Chess FoundationStudent Team". Contributions are tax-deductible.

## JOIN THE UNITED STATES CHESS FEDERATION

USCF is a non-profit democratic organization, the official governing body and FIDE unit for chess in the USA. Anyone interested in advancing American chess is eligible for membership.

Membership, including CHESS LIFE subscription, eligibility for USCF-rating, and all privileges: 1 yr.: $\$ 5.00 ; 2 \mathrm{yrs.:} \$ 9.50 ; 3 \mathrm{yrs.:} \$ 13.50$; Sustaining: $\$ 10.00$ (becomes life Membership after 10 payments); Life: $\$ 100.00$. Family Membership (two or more family members at same address, only one CHESS LIFE subscription): rates as above for first family member, plus following for each additional member: 1 yr.: $\$ 2.50 ; 2$ yrs.: $\$ 4.75 ; 3$ yrs.: $\$ 6.75$.

CHESS LIFE is published monthly by USCF and entered as second-class matter at Dubuque, Iowa. Non-member 1 -yr. subscription: $\$ 4.00$ ( $\$ 5.00$ outside USA); single copy: 40c ( 50 c outaide USA). Change of address: Allow four weeks notice; please give us both the new address and the old address, including the numbers and dates on the top line of your stencil.
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To the Editor:
In the December 1963 Chess Life, page 308, John W. Collins reports on a chess game Eldridge-Johnson. After White's 30th move, Mr. Collins remarks: "White might have announced mate in seven," and gives the remaining moves:
30. RxPch, K-N1; 31. R/3xPch, K-R1; 32. RxNch, K-N1; 33. R/R7-N7ch, K-R1; 34. N-N6ch, QxN; 35. RxCch, B-B3; 36. BxB mate.
(We insert a diagram of the position prior to White's thirticth move.-Ed.)


In re-examining the position before White's 30th move, I discovered, what apparently escaped both White and Mr. Collins, that White might have announced mate in six, or even in three, instead of seven. The six-move mate follows the same course as the seven-move mate through the 32 nd move, then proceeds:
33. R/B7-N7ch, K-B1; 34. N-Q7ch (or, N-N6ch), QxN; 35. R-R8 mate.

The three-move mate has two variations:
30. RxPch, K-N1; 31. R/7xPch, K-R1; 32. N-B7 mate; or 31. ........, K-B1; 32. R-N8 mate.

Since some of my colleagues and I at Carnegie Institute of Technology have been studying the psychology of the choice of moves in chess, I was curious as to why the players and Mr. Collins found the seven-move mate rather than the shorter ones. From our previous analysis, we had hypothesized that in searching for possible mating combinations, a good player generally examines those lines first that allow the defender the fewest alternatives. We had obtained some confirmation of this hypothesis from the well-known game of Ed. LaskerThomas (1912), where Lasker announced and delivered mate in eight. It was later discovered that the mate could have been obtained in seven moves. However, the seven-move mate requires the attacker, at a certain point, to play P-B4ch, allowing the defender two replies; while at the same point, the attacker can play P-R4ch, which allows the defender only one reply. Lasker explored the latter alternative and found the eight-move mate.

I was therefore surprised, and pleased, to observe that exactly the same condition holds in the Eldridge-Johnson game.

On the 31st move, $\mathrm{R} / 3 \times \mathrm{Pch}$, leading to the six- or seven-move mate, allows only one reply; while $\mathrm{R} / 7 \mathrm{xPch}$, leading to the three-move mate, allows two replies. The players and the annotator explored the former alternative, and apparently overlooked the latter.

Our research group has written a computer program for mating combinations, incorporating the above-mentioned rule of thumb and some others. (A report on an earlier version of this program has been published in the October 1962 issue of Behavioral Science.) To get further insight into the game discussed here, I gave the position after Black's 29th move to the mating combinations program, to see what it would do. (My prediction was that it would find the six-move mate.) It found a six-move mate all right, but one substantially more elegant than that given above. It followed the main line through the 32 nd move, then proceeded:
33. R-R8ch!, KxR; 34. N-N6db1 ch, KN1; 35. R-N7 mate.

Of course, I probably should not have been too surprised, for the mating combinations program has shown itself on other occasions to be pretty formidable. Given the Lasker-Thomas position, it finds the checkmate the eight-move variation). It has also found the checkmate in 41 of the positions used as illustrations by Fine in the chapter on mating combinations of his book on the middle game. In all but two or three of these positions, it finds the mate after examing considerably less than 100 variations, in many cases 20 or fewer. I wish to emphasize that the program does this not by rapidly scanning all possible continuations (this would in any event be impossible in the more complicated positions even for the fastest computers), but by exploring selectively on the basis of a small set of rules of thumb or heuristics.

## HERBERT A. SIMON <br> Professor of Administration \& Psychology <br> Carnegie Inst. of Technology

The Lasker-Thomas game referred to in Prof. Simon's letter was featured in CHESS LIFE, June 1962, with Edward Lasker's own notes. The position in question is:


## Lasker comments:

Here 1 had only about a minute to spare, and I played the obvious 14. PR4ch. Effective, but brutal. More subtle
would have been 14 . P-B4ch, and Black would have been mate one move sooner: K-Rö; 15. P-N3ch, K-R6; 16. B-B1ch, B-N7; 17. N-B2 mate. In the position of the diagram, 14. P-B4ch, KxP would even require only two more moves: 15 . P-N3ch, K-N4; 16. P-R4 mate, or 15. ........, K-B6; 16. O.O mate!!

| 14. P-R4ch | K-B5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 15. P-N3ch | K-B6 |
| 16. B-K2ch | K-N7 |
| 17. R-R2ch | K-N8 |
| 18. K-Q2 mate. |  |

"Again 16. K-B1 and 17. N-R2 mate would have saved a move, but the final position as played certainly produces a unique picture. Anyone seeing it would have his difficulties in figuring out how the Black King got to where he is."

Lasker's time-trouble on move 14 is explained by the fact that this famous game was played as a variant of five-minute chess. As Lasker explains it, "Both clocks are set at 12, just as in a tournament game, but neither player is permitted to exceed his opponent's time by more than five minutes at any stage of the game. Thus, if one of the contestants plays leisurely, the other can also take his time. But a player who moves fast, compels his adversary to follow stuit."

To the Editor:
Robert J. Fischer's win over Bisguier in the New York Open is a fine game, but Fischer's comments on the analytic history of Steinitz's bizarre move 9 . N-R3 in the Two Knights' Defense are incomplete and misleading. The move was given a fair trial in master chess seventy years ago, and found inadequate. Steinitz played it five times against Tchigorin and lost four times, winning only once.

The move was suggested by Steinitz in his "Modern Chess Instructor" and immediately Tchigorin challenged Steinitz to play it in the famous cable match. To prepare himself for the encounter Tchigorin played two correspondence games with the strong Russian amateur A. Markov. In one of these games he tried - and rejected - ........, P-N4; in the other he played an early ........, BxN. The latter move he rejected because he found it better to save the QB for the

attack for which he had given up the Pawn.

Mr. Fischer chooses to quote the one game won by Steinitz, but this line9. ........, B-QB4; 10. 0-0, O-O; 11. P-Q3dropped out of play after Makovetz-Charousek, Budapest, 1892, which continued 11. ......... N-N2! 12. K-R1, P-N4; 13. PQB3, B-N3; 14. B-K3, N-Q4 with advantage to Black. This game is given in Sergeant's collection of Charousek's games as no. 68, but it can also be found in a not very recondite source- PCO , p . 446 note (a).

If Mr. Fischer really believes the move has gone under due to "vigorous Russian propaganda," let him tell it to the Russians. I am sure he could get Keres or Korchnoi to play the position with the Black pieces in the next Challenger's Tournament. That would provide a real test of the value of the move and of Mr. Fischer's analyses. Frankly, as a Fischer fan I hope he does not follow up on this suggestion.

## CHRISTOPHER BECKER Hamden, Conn.

## KASHDAN TO CONDUCT TWA TOUR

A Trans World Airline tour that will have a heavy accent on chess will be directed by Grandmaster Isaac Kashdan from November 16 to December 7.

The main feature of the tour will be nine days spent in Tel Aviv, Israel in conjunction with the finals of the Chess Olympiad. The tour will leave New York on November 16, will take in Tel Aviv from November 17 through November 25. From Israel, the tour will wend its way to Italy, Switzerland, France, and Great Britain under Mr. Kashdan's direction.

In each of the countries visited, there will be chess lectures, simultaneous play and casual meetings with the leading chess figures. Those interested in further details should write to Mr. Kashdan at 834 S. Wooster St., Los Angeles 35, California.

## SKEMA TOPS MOTOR CITY

The 1964 Motor City Invitational, played in Detroit from January to March, 1964, was won by Kazys Skema who went through the 10 -player round robin without defeat, compiling a score of 8-1. Dr. Mark Pence, $61 / 2$, was second and Jack Witeczek, 6, took third. The Kingsmen Chess Club sponsored the annual event and Dr. William A. Henkin directed.

Previous Motor City winners:
1960-Wesley Burgar
1961-Stephan Popel
1962-Wesley Burgar
1963-Carl Driscoll

## DALY TAKES STURGIS EVENT

Harlow B. Daly, octogenarian Expert from Sanford, Maine added the George Sturgis International Tournament to his list of recent successes. Daly won the Boston event on March $13-15$ with an impressive score of $5^{1 / 2}-1 / 2$.

Daly, whose chess career spans the years between Steinitz and Fischer, became the first recipient of the International Silver Tray as a result of his victory. The Sturgis tournament will be held again next March.

Tied for second and third, with 4.1, were Alexander Keyes and Eugene Solot of Massachusetts. Other prizes: David Scheffer and Anthony Suraci (tied) Class A; Dr. Vaughn Sturtevant, Frank Hecker, Robert Webster, Douglas Nohava, all tied, Class B; Hilda Adrian, Class C; William Weber, Top Unrated.
Thirty-two players participated in the event, adding $\$ 64.00$ to the USCF's International Fund. Robert Goodspeed was the tournament director.

## SREDANOVIC SCORES IN MONTEREY

Blazo Sredanovic, a newcomer to the ranks of the USCF, lived up to the incendiary implications of his first name by fireballing his way to a $5-0$ victory in the Monterey International Open on March $14-15$. Sredanovic led a field of 71 players in a tournament that contributed \$142.00 to the USCF's International Fund. George Koltanowski, International Master and blindfold expert, directed the event on behalf of the sponsoring Monterey (Calif.) Chess Club.

Duncan Suttles, winner of the Junior Championship at the 1963 U. S. Open, scored $41 / 2$ points to take a clear second. A total of nine players finished with 4 points-third place going to USCF Master Tibor Weinberger on tie-break points. A. Schoene was fourth and P. Smith took fifth. Schoene also took the Expert Award.

Other prizes: Class A, F. Thornally; Class B, R. Hart; Class C, A. Benson; Unrated, D. Blohm.

## BENEDICTO WINS L.I. OPEN

Raul Benedicto, USCF Master who won the U. S. Amateur Championship in 1960, scored 5-1 to take first place in the Long Island Open played in Farmingdale, New York from February 22 through March 1. Howard Rosenberg, Charles Rehberg, and Don Halloran all scored $41 / 2$, finishing in the order listed when the ties were broken.

The Junior Prize was awarded to James Savage (age 14), the Class A Prize to A. Lauro and the Class B Prize to P. Orth. The Republic Aviation Chess Club and the Huntington Chess Club were co-sponsors of the event, which was directed by Thomas M. Bradley.

> IT'S UP TO YOU
> to tell us that you're moving. Copies of CHESS LIFE are not forwarded by the postoffice. We need six weeks notice of any change of address.

## ARIZONA HIGH SCHOOLS SET CHESS RECORD

The third annual Arizona High School Chess Championships, sponsored by the Phoenix Chess Club, were played on February 22 and March 14 and drew a record turnout of 102 players from 17 high schools throughout the state. A total of 96 boys and 6 girls took part in the 7 -round event, held at the Phoenix Adult Center through the cooperation of the Phoenix Parks and Recreation Department.

Geoffery N. Gilbert, a sophomore at Tempe High School and a USCF-rated "A" player, took top honors in the tournament with a score of $61 / 2-1 / 2$. Kathryn Zetterlund of West Phoenix High School won the girls' title with 4-3. Cortez High School of Phoenix, coached by Michael Roseman, had the top 4-player team and won the Team Trophy $20-8$, edging out Tuscon's Ampitheater High School on tie-break points.

Jack L. Gibson was director of the event and Russell D. Osterhout was in charge of promotion and publicity.

## SPILLER SWEEPS INDIANA

Arthur Spiller of Santa Monica, Calif. rang up a 5-0 score to take a clear first in the Indiana International Open, played in Indianapolis on March 21-22. The field of 58 players was probably the largest ever assembled for an Indiana chess tournament and the USCF International Fund was augmented to the tune of \$116.00.

Close behind Spiller, with $41 / 2$, was Lt. Donato Rivera Jr., from Puerto Rico, who is currently stationed at Chanute Air Force Base in Illinois. James Young led the 4 -pointers to take third place ahead of Edward Vano, Highland, Indiana and Constantine Rasis, Chicago. A total of three masters and six experts took part in the event and International Master Robert Byrne acted as adjudicator. Norb Matthews, USCF V-P Region 5, was the Tournament Director.

Frank McReynolds (51/2-1/2) took top honors in the first Santa Monica Rating Tournament, concluded on February 28. Arthur Spiller (5) was second and E. Gardos ( $41 / 2$ ) was third. A total of 18 players turned out for the event, sponsored by the Santa Monica Bay Chess Club.


# The Second International Rating List and the Historical Ratings 

At the time of the publication of the first international rating list (CHESS LIFE August 1962) it was indicated that the ratings of the international masters were computed for the period from 1880 through the early months of 1962 . This work was undertaken originally to test the integrity of the USCF rating system as the system was applied over an extended period of time. However, it became apparent very soon that this type of investigation could yield very interesting information about the development of the skills of the individual masters and also about the relative strengths of the masters living in different generations. Accordingly the study was extended back in time to the date of the first international tournament, namely, London 1851.

## The Methods Used

From 1880 to the present time the ratings were calculated by essentially the same method that is currently used by the USCF for the calculations of new ratings with only a slight modification of the constants of the formulae consistent with the larger samples of games available from international tournaments as compared to what is available from the short domestic tournaments. This method has been described briefly in CHESS LIFE of June 1961 and more extensively in a privately printed analytical supplement, so there is no need to repeat the description here. In brief, the calculus of probabilities are used to derive a relation between the percentage score achieved by a player in an event, the strength of his competition and what is termed the rating of the individual. This rating is furthermore continually readjusted on the basis of new data obtained from subsequent events. This

by ARPAD E. ELO<br>Chairman, USCF Rating Committee

method which will be designated as the continuous method is, of course, a hunting method which is always seeking the best estimate of what is the current rating. It is a method which can be successfully applied only if there is sufficient activity within the chess-playing population and for that reason could be used only from 1880 onward when international tournaments became more regular and more frequent.

Prior to 1880 , and also for a limited number of players after 1880, the ratings were computed by another method which will be designated as the method of successive approximation. In this method the average rating over a finite but short period of time is calculated for all the individuals included in the study. Usually the period used has been a fiveyear interval and all the data accumulated on the players during such an interval is processed in successive cycles of computation until a set of self-consistent ratings are obtained for all the individuals included in the study of any half-decade interval. This method is perhaps the most reliable means of obtaining the relative ratings of the members of a group over a finite but short period of time. When such ratings are combined with those obtained by the continuous method it is possible to splice the ratings of adjoining time intervals and so construct rating usage or rating vs. time relationships for players who remain active for any length of time. Comparison of players who lived in different eras then becomes possible by purely statistical means, since, among masters, long chess careers, i.e. 25 years or more, are the rule rather than the exception.

## The Results

The results of this historical study are given in two tables which are self explanatory. In Table I there are included most of the "name" players of the past. Some contemporary players are included in this list also if it is evident that their peak period or best 25 years are in the past. For the players of the Morphy era all the data from 1851 to the sec-
ond London International Tournament of 1862 was lumped together so that the ratings represent neither the peaks or the career averages. This was the only way the data could be treated since the practice of playing matches at odds and the knock-out form of the tournaments during this period severely limited the useful data. Table II includes only those contemporary grandmasters and highly-rated international masters on whom a minimum of a 25 -game sample has been obtained during the $1961-63$ period. Ratings for this period and also for the best five-year periods are given only to the nearest 10 points. A finer resolution is not justified, for the probable error even on a 100 -game sample is about 20 points. It should be recognized that in every type of measurement, whether physical, biological or psychological there exists an inherent uncertainty regardless of the system or method of measurement used. In particular, in psychological measurements where individual behavior or performance is being measured these uncertainties loom large. The uncertainties in the results of this particular study are due principally to the paucity of continuous data over the lifetime of the individuals studied. The mathematical apparatus used in the study is actually more refined than it needs to be.

Finally it should be recognized that these ratings represent a measurement of performance in match and tournament competition, and as such form the only objective estimate of the strength of play of the individual masters. The ratings do not pretend to measure creativity, inventiveness or the attacking style of the players or any other quality which may play a role in the subjective evaluation of a player's greatness.

## TABLE I. Ratings of the Chess Masters <br> of 19th \& 20 Centuries

| Player | Best 5-year <br> Average |
| :--- | :--- | | Best 25-year |
| :---: |
| Average |


| Player | Best 5-year Average | Best 25-year Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Euwe, Dr. M. | . 2640 | 2610 |
| Falkbeer, E. | 2400 |  |
| Fine, R. | . 2660 | 2625 |
| Flohr, S. | . 2620 | 2575 |
| Foltys, J. ........... | . 2530 |  |
| Fuderer, A. .......... | . 2540 |  |
| Gligoric, S. .......... | . 2640 |  |
| Golombek, H. | 2460 | 2400 |
| Gruenfeld, E. | . 2540 | 2495 |
| Guimard, C. | 2500 | 2465 |
| Gunsberg, I. | . 2550 | 2450 |
| Harrwitz, D. | . 2490 (B) |  |
| Horwitz, B. ......... | . 2420 (B) |  |
| Horowitz, I. | . 2510 | 2460 |
| Janowski, D. | . 2570 | 2495 |
| Judd, M. | . 2430 | 2390 |
| Kan, I. | 2530 | 2475 |
| Kashdan, I. | . 2580 | 2525 |
| Keres, P. | 2670 | 2645 |
| Kieseritzky, L. | 2490 (B) |  |
| Kmoch, H. | . 2450 |  |
| Kolisch, I. | . 2560 |  |
| Konstantinopolsky | . 2530 |  |
| Kostic, B. | 2520 | 2475 |
| Kotov, A. | . 2620 | 2565 |
| Kupchik, A. | . 2500 |  |
| Lasker, Dr. E. | . 2720 | 2690 |
| Leonhardt, P. | . 2480 | 2430 |
| Levenfisch, G. | 2540 | 2490 |
| Lilienthal, A. | . 2540 | 2520 |
| Lowenthal, J. | . 2520 (B) |  |
| Lundin, E. | . 2500 | 2460 |
| Makagonov, V. | . 2540 | 2490 |
| Marco, G. | . 2470 | 2440 |
| Maroczy, G. | . 2610 | 2565 |
| Marshall, F. | . 2560 | 2545 |
| Mason, J. | . 2530 | 2475 |
| Matanovic, A. | . 2570 |  |
| McKenzie, G. H. | 2550 | 2510 |
| Mieses, J. | . 2460 | 2445 |
| Mikenas, V. | . 2540 | 2515 |
| Morphy, P. | . 2690 (B) |  |
| Naidorf, M. | . 2650 | 2620 |
| Neumann, G. | . 2560 |  |
| Nimzowitsch | . 2610 | 2555 |
| O'Kelly, A. | . 2530 |  |
| Opocensky, K. | .. 2500 | 2420 |
| Paulsen, L. | . 2550 | 2520 |
| Perlis, J. | .. 2490 |  |
| Petrov, V. | .. 2510 |  |
| Pillsbury, H. | . 2600 |  |
| Pilnik, H. | 2530 | 2485 |
| Pirc, V. | . 2540 | 2510 |
| Przepiorka, D. | .. 2500 |  |
| Rabinowitsch, E. | . 2540 | 2490 |
| Ragozin, V. | . 2540 | 2500 |
| Reshevsky, S. | . 2660 | 2645 |
| Reti, R. | .. 2540 |  |
| Riemann, F. | . 2450 |  |
| Riviere, A. de | ... 2420 |  |
| Romanovsky, P. | . 2510 |  |
| Rosenthal, S. | .. 2480 | 2430 |
| Rossetto, H. | . 2500 |  |
| Rossolimo, N. | . 2540 |  |
| Rubinstein, A. | . 2640 | 2590 |
| Saemisch, F. | . 2470 | 2420 |
| St. Amant, P. de | . 2400 (B) |  |
| Salwe, G. ..... | . 2480 |  |
| Schallopp, E. | . 2450 | 2400 |
| Schiffers, E. | . 2450 | 2420 |
| Schlechter, C. | . 2570 | 2545 |
| Showalter, J. | . 2460 | 2400 |
| Smyslov, V. | . 2680 |  |
| Spielmann, R. | .. 2540 | 2515 |
| Stahlberg, G. ......... | ... 2600 | 2570 |


| Staunton, H. ..................................... 2520 | (B) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Steiner, E. ..................................... 2510 |  |
| Steiner, H. ........................................ 2450 | 2440 |
| Steiner, L. ........................................ 2500 | 2450 |
| Steinitz, W. ...................................... 2650 | 2625 |
| Stoltz, G. .......................................... 2510 | 2470 |
| Sultan Khan .................................... 2520 |  |
| Szabo, L. ......................................... 2600 | 2585 |
| Tal, M. ............................................. 2700 | (C) |
| Tarrasch, Dr. S. ............................... 2610 | 2570 |
| Tartakower, S. ................................. 2540 | 2525 |
| Teichmann, R. ................................. 2550 | 2525 |
| Thomas, Sir G. ................................. 2450 | 2410 |
| Tolush, A. ........................................ 2560 | 2515 |
| Treybal, K. ...................................... 2490 |  |
| Trifunovic, Dr, P. ............................ 2540 | 2530 |
| Tschigorin, M. ................................. 2580 | 2555 |
| Vidmar, Dr. M. ................................. 2600 | 2550 |
| Walbrodt, A. ..................................... 2490 |  |
| Weiss, M. .......................................... 2540 |  |
| Williams, E. ..................................... 2450 | (B) |
| Winawer, S. ..................................... 2530 | 2505 |
| Wolf, H. ........................................... 2480 | 2450 |
| Yates, F. D. ...................................... 2450 |  |
| Zukertort, J. ..................................... 2610 |  |

(A) Anderssen's peak and life time ratings were extrapolated from his performances in his later years.
(B) Ratings determined for the Morphy era. These are not to be construed as cither peaks or life time ratings except in the case of Morphy, whose active career was actually less than 5 years.
(C) Tal's rating here is an early 5 year average which is, however, not necessarily his ultimate peak.

## Acknowledgement:

Grateful acknowledgement is made to Mr. James Bolton of New Haven, Conn. who generously assisted with the research work and who from his extensive chess library furnished numerous crosstables and match records of the past.-A. E. Elo

THE TOP TEN
1961-63

| Petrosian | 2690 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Fischer | 2690 |
| Keres | 2670 |
| Botvinnik | 2660 |
| Geller | 2660 |
| Spassky | 2650 |
| Korchnoi | 2650 |
| Tal | 2630 |
| Polugaevsky | 2630 |
| Smyslov | 2620 |

Prof. Elo's history-making rating list calls forth our display of chess talent from the 19th and early 20 th centuries. Above, left, to right, Emanuel Lasker, Howard Staunton, Adolf Anderssen; below, Paul Morphy and Wilhelm Steinitz. Now they, too, are USCF-rated!
TABLE II. Average Ratings of the International Grandmasters and Selected International Masters for 1961-63.
Antoshin — USSR ........................................................................ 2550 Lengyel - Hungary ..... 2490
Aronin - USSR ..... 2530
Averbach - USSR ..... 2600
Barcza - Hungary ..... 2490
Benko - USA ..... 2560
Bertok - Yugoslavia ..... 2440
Bilek - Hungary ..... 2500
Bisguier - USA ..... 2510
Bobotsov - Bulgaria ..... 2450
Bolbochan, Jul. - Argentina ..... 2510
Boleslavsky - USSR ..... 2560
Bondarevsky - USSR ..... 2480
Botvinnik - USSR ..... 2660
Bronstein - USSR ..... 2590
Byrne, D. - USA ..... 2480
Byrne, R. - USA ..... 2530
Ciocaltea - Rumania ..... 2480
Citic - Yugoslavia ..... 2450
Czerniak - Yugoslavia ..... 2440
Damjanovic - Yugoslavia ..... 2470
Darga - W. Germany ..... 2540
Dely - Hungary ..... 2480
Donner - Holland ..... 2490
Duckstein - Austria ..... 2440
Eliskases - Argentina ..... 2500
Evans - USA ..... 2580
Fichtl - Czechoslovakia ..... 2430
Filip - Czechoslovakia ..... 2530
Fischer - USA ..... 2690
Flohr - USSR ..... 2490
Fuchs - E. Germany ..... 2420
Furman - USSR ..... 2540
Geller - USSR ..... 2660
German - Brazil ..... 2420
Gheorgiu - Rumania ..... 2450
Ghitescu - Rumania ..... 2430
Gipslis - USSR ..... 2530
Gligoric - Yugoslavia ..... 2590
Guimard - Argentina ..... 2450
Haag - Hungary ..... 2450
Honfi - Hungary ..... 2470
Hort - Czechoslovakia ..... 2500
Ivkov - Yugoslavia ..... 2550
Johannessen - Norway ..... 2410
Karaklaic - Yugoslavia ..... 2420
Kavalek - Czechoslov. ..... 2500
Keres - USSR ..... 2670
Kholmov - USSR ..... 2560
Korchnoi - USSR ..... 2650
Kotov - USSR ..... 2600
Larsen - Denmark ..... 2540
LilienthaI - USSR ..... 2530
Lombardy - USA ..... 2550
Malich - E. Germany ..... 2480
Matanovic - Yugoslavia ..... 2520
Mednis - USA ..... 2440
Mikenas - USSR ..... 2490
Milev - Bulgaria ..... 2430
Milic - Yugoslavia ..... 2430
Minev - Bulgaria ..... 2470
Najdorf - Argentina ..... 2590
Ney - USSR ..... 2540
Olafsson - Iceland ..... 2550
Pachmann - Czechoslov. ..... 2540
Padevsky - Bulgaria ..... 2510
Panno - Argentine ..... 2520
Parma - Yugoslavia ..... 2530
Penrose - Great Britain ..... 2480
Petrosian - USSR ..... 2690
Pietssch - E. Germany ..... 2460
Pilnik - Argentine ..... 2510
Pirc - Yugoslavia ..... 2410
Polugaevsky - USSR ..... 2630
Pomar - Spain ..... 2550
Portisch - Hungary ..... 2570
Puc - Yugoslavia ..... 2450
Rabar - Yugoslavia ..... 2430
Reshevsky - USA ..... 2590
Robatsch - Austria ..... 2450
Rossetto - Argentine ..... 2430
Sangiunetti - Argentine ..... 2510
Shamkovitsch - USSR ..... 2520
Sherwin - USA ..... 2440
Simagin - USSR ..... 2540
Smyslov - USSR ..... 2620
Spassky - USSR ..... 2650
Stahlberg - Sweden ..... 2460
Stein - USSR ..... 2610
Suetin - USSR ..... 2510
Szabo - Hungary ..... 2540
Taimanov - USSR ..... 2580
Tal - USSR ..... 2630
Tan - Indonesia ..... 2440
Tolusch - USSR ..... 2470
Trifunovic - Yugoslavia ..... 2530
Tringov - Bulgaria ..... 2500
Udovcic - Yugoslavia ..... 2470
Uhlmann - E. Germany ..... 2540
Unzicker - W. Germany ..... 2530
Vasiukov - USSR ..... 2610
Weinstein - USA ..... 2470

International masters on whom samples of less than 25 games have been available during the period covered are not included; nor are any included with a rating less than 2400.

## THEY'RE RATED TOPS

World Champion Tigran Petrosian and U.S. Champion Robert J. Fischer earned the highest USCF ratings for their performance during the period 1961-63: an identical 2690. Of the top ten players of this period, only Fischer is not a member of the "Soviet School"!


## Fischer Talks Chess

Mr. Fischer begins a new series of articles in which he annotates all the games of the Steinitz-Dubois match of more than a century ago. This match, played toward tha beginning of Steinitz's long career, well illustrates the open, combinational style of play which earned the young Steinitz the nickname of "The Austrian Morphy." In addition to its historical significance, this series will provide the CHESS LIFE reader with background material for such sensational recent games as Fischer-Bisguier (CL, December 1963, p. 302) and Fischer-Evans (CL, January 1964, p. 5).

## GAME ONE

The players of 1862 knew something very valuable that the players of today would do well to make note of: 1. P-Q4 leads to nothing!

## KING'S GAMBIT

## Dubois

Steinitz

## 1. P-K4 <br> P-K4

As far as I know, this is the only way Steinitz answered 1. P-K4 in a career of nearly forty years! Naturally, I am excluding odds games, since when giving pawn-and-move (Black removes his KBP) 1. ........, P-K4?? is answered by 2. Q-R5 ch and Black can resign.
Steinitz never played the Sicilian or the French Defenses. The latter, by the way, he considered one of the dullest of all openings. Alekhine's Defense, 1. ........, N-KB3 had not been invented yet-although I've come across an example of it in the collection of Anderssen's games edited by Dr. von Gottschall. Anderssen gave the odds of QN and Gottschall ungenerously gave 1........, N-KB3 two question marks-figuring it to be just one of those patzer moves.
Steinitz pronounced 1. ........., P.QB3 "bizarre." 1. ........, P-Q4 merely loses time for Black and Steinitz, of course, instinctively rejected such lemons as 1. ........, P-Q3, 1. ........, P-KN3, 1. ........, PQN3, 1. ........, N-QB3, etc., etc.

## 2. P-KB4

Although Dubois was an expert on this opening and wrote a booklet on its intricacies, it was an unwise policy to play it against Steinitz. He had a knack of winning on either side of the King's Gambit! I would have played either the Evans Gambit or the Ruy Lopez against him and then tried to take advantage of his eccentricities in those openings.

Against the Ruy Lopez, for example, Steinitz's favorite continuation was 3 . KN-K2. Later on he even experimented with 3. $\qquad$ , P-B3. Only a Steinitz can get away with such a move.

Against the Evans Gambit Steinitz played 6. ........, Q-B3, etc. See his match
games with Tchigorin. Once, he even tried 4. ........, B-B1!?

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
\text { 2. } & \text {...... } & \text { PxP } \\
\text { 3. } & \text { B- } 4 . . .
\end{array}
$$

I consider this, the Bishop's Gambit, to be more promising than 3 . N-KB3, which is refuted by 3........., P-Q3! The old way, 3. $\qquad$ P-KN4 is still good enough for equality.

## 3. ........ P.Q4

Probably the strongest continuation. Nowadays 3. ........, N-KB3 is considered the bust to the King's Bishop's Gambit, but it seems to me that White's possibilities have been seriously underestimated. Just for example: 3. ........, NKB3; 4. N-QB3, P-B3; 5. B-N3, P-Q4; 6. PxP, PxP; 7. P-Q4, B-Q3; 8. KN-K2, O-O; 9. BxBP, BxB; 10. NxB, R-K1 ch; 11. KN-K2, N-N5 and now all the books give "etc., with excellent attacking chances for Black." (See diagram).

Position after 11. ........, N-N5 (analysis).


However, after 12. NxP, B-K3 (best) one line might run: 13. P-KR3, BxN; 14. PxN, BxP; 15. R-R2, B-B6; 16. Q-Q3, RxNch; 17. RxR, BxR; 18. QxB, N-B3; 19. O-O-O, NxP; 20. BxPch, KxB; 21. Q-B4 ch, K-N3; 22. RxN, Q-N4 ch; 23. K-N1, R-KB1; 24. R-Q6 ch R-B3; 25. Q-K4 ch, K-R3; 26. R-Q1, Q-B5; 27. RR1 ch, K-N4; 28. Q-Q5 ch, KxP-and White mates in four.
After 12. NxP, Q-R5ch is bad altogether because of $13 . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 6 ; 14$. Q-Q2, Q-N7; 15. O-O-O! and now if 15. ........, QxN/2; 16. N-B7 with an easy

win or if 15 . $\qquad$ RxN; 16. KR-K1 with an easier win.

White also gets a good game against 3. ........, P-KB4 (which the late Abe Turner considered to be Black's strongest reply) 4. N-QB3, Q-R5 ch; 5. K-B1, PxP; 6. NxP, P-B3; 7. N-KB3, Q-R4; 8. Q-K2, K-Q1; 9. QN-N5, P-Q4; 10. N-K5! with the better game for White. (Staunton)
4. BxP

Best. 4. PxP contains a little trap, since after 4. ........., Q-R5 ch; 5. K-B1, P-B6? 6. B-N5ch followed by 7. NxP wins a pawn for White. However, after 5. ........, B-Q3, Black has an excellent game.
4.

P-QB3
This move has its pluses and minuses. Generally speaking, Black delays it until later in the game, since the White Bishop usually comes under attack anyway by Black's N-K2.
5. B-N3
Q-R5ch
6. K-BI
P-KN4
7. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$
........

If 7. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{QB} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2 ; 8$. P-N3, PxP; 9. K-N2, BxN!; 10. QPxB, PxP; 11. RxP, QxP ch, etc. Note that with the Black pawn on QB2 and the White Bishop on Q5 this line would not be possible.

```
7. ........
Q-R4
8. P-Q4
``` \(\qquad\)
8. P-KR4 is premature: e.g., 8. ........, B-N2; 9. K-N1, P-R3; 10. PxP, B-Q5 ch.
\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text { 8. } & & \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 2 \\
\text { 9. } & \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3 & \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 2
\end{array}
\]

10. P-K5

Well played. White takes advantage of 4. ........, P-QB3; he now threatens N-K4
with a powerful game. Also, White could possibly force a draw in the diagram position with 10. P-KR4; e.g., 10. ........, P-KR3; 11. K-N1, P-N5; 12. N-K5, BxN; 13. PxB, QxKP; 14. Q-B1, P-B6 (not 14. ........, N-N3; 15. P-R5, P-N6; 16. B-K3, etc.) 15. PxP, Q-N6 ch; 16. Q-N2, QK8 ch.
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 10. ....... B-B4 } \\
\text { 11. P.Q5 }
\end{array}
\]

This wild move throws the game away. By playing simply 11. Q-K2, Q-N3 (if 11. ......... P-N5; 12. N-K1, P-B6; 13. PxP, PxP; 14. NxP, B-N5; 15. K-B2); 12. KB2 followed by R-K1 and N-K4 White would have a great advantage, if not a won game.
11. ........ P-N5

Could White have overlooked this move?

> 12. N-Q4 BXKP

White's game is now hopeless.


Perhaps White speculated on Black playing 14. ........, N-N6 ch; 15. K-N1, NxR; 16. BxP, etc. or 14. ........, N-N6ch; 15. K-N1, O-0; 16. BxP with fair chances. Of course after the text move, if 15. QxB?? N-N6 ch.
\begin{tabular}{lr} 
15. N-K4 & N-Q2 \\
16. Q-B2 & QR-K1
\end{tabular}
16. ......... N-N6 ch certainly looked very tempting, but Steinitz has worked out a forced win.
17. BxP
18. N-N3
B-Q5

Forced. 18. Q-K2, N-K6 ch wins outright. Chessplayers hated Steinitz for this type of move!
18. \(\qquad\) NxNch
19. QxN Q-B4

The simple but brutal point. There is nothing to be done against the twin threats of 20 . , R-K5 and 20 . B-K4.

20. R-KI
B-K4
21. \(R \times B\) RxR
22. Q-B2

White could have held out a little longer with 22. K-N1, R-K5; 23. B-Q6, followed by P-KR3-but it's a lost cause.
22. .......
R-K5
23. B-Q6
Q-N4

Naturally; trading Queens would give White some chance of saving himself in the ending.
24. P-N3
KR-K1
25. PxP Q-N4ch

Black could win at once by 25. R-K8ch; 26. K-N2, R/8-K7, but the text move puts an end to all White's hopes by picking off the advanced QBP.

\section*{26. K-N2}

If 26. P-B4, QxP. The ending is all forced.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 26. ........ & R-K7 \\
\hline 27. BxPch & K-N2 \\
\hline 28. BxR & QxPch \\
\hline 29. K-NI & RxQ \\
\hline 30. KxR & QxR \\
\hline 31. BxN & Q-B6ch \\
\hline 32. K-K1 & Q-Q4 \\
\hline 33. Resigns & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
U.S. Champion Robert J. Fischer will wind up his U.S. tour with a 100 -board simultaneous and lecture in New York City in early June. Arrangements for this event have not yet been completed -watch our May issue for defails.

\section*{Everybody A Winner}

If you missed out on the loot and fun last year, plan NOW to play in the

1964
LAS VEGAS OPEN

\author{
JULY 4-5-6-7 \\ - - - \\ More and Bigger Cash Prizes, Awards and Trophies
}

Free coupons for meals, drinks, gifts
-Nothing like it anywhere-

For details about Entry Fee, Cash Awards, Hotel Reservations - write

ART GAMLIN
611 N. Main St. Las Vegas, Nev.

\section*{GAME COLLECTIONS}

Alekhine, Alexander
MY BEST GAMES OF CHESS
Volume One: 1908-1923. Diagrams. 267 pp. List Price \(\$ 5.00\) Members \(\$ 4.25\) Volume Two: 1924-1937. Diagrams. 285 pp . List Price \(\$ 5.50\) Members \(\$ 4.68\) This famous two-volume collection of the games of the greatest attacking player of all times is also one of the greatest works of chess instruction ever written.

Alexander, C. H. O'D. ALEKHINE'S
BEST GAMES OF CHESS 1938-1945
Alexander completes the trilogy of Alekhine's best games with 42 annotated examples from the last years of his fabulous career. Diagrams. 118 pp.

List Price \(\$ 2.75\) Members \(\$ \mathbf{2 . 4 7}\)
Reinfeld, Fred THE DEVELOPMENT OF A CHESS GENIUS: 100 INSTRUCTIVE GAMES OF ALEKHINE
These games from the period 1905-1914, reveal the young Alekhine in his first encounters with such giants of the Chess World as Rubinstein, Schlechter, Tarrasch, and Lasker. Formerly titled "The Unknown Alekhine," 204 diagrams. 242 pp .

Paperbound \$1.35
Botvinnik, \(M\).
100 SELECTED GAMES
The World Champien annotates his best games from the period 1926-1946. 221 diagrams. 272 pp.

Paperbound \(\$ 1.50\)

\section*{Kotov and Yudovich}

\section*{THE SOVIET SCHOOL OF CHESS}

A superb collection of 128 fully annotated games played by 51 of the outstanding Russian players of today. 30 photos. 182 diagrams. 390 pp .

Paperbound \(\$ 2.00\)
Lasker, Edward CHESS SECRETS I LEARNED FROM THE MASTERS
This unique collection of games is also a textbook that shows the amateur the way to mastery by presenting and analyzing the author's games with Emanuel Lasker, Marshall, Alekhine, Capablanca and other great players he encountered during his long and distinguished career. Illus. 428 pp .
\[
\text { List Price } \$ 5.00 \quad \text { Members } \$ 4.25
\]

Marshall, F. J. MARSHALL'S BEST GAMES OF CHESS
140 games full of brilliant attacks, astonishing sacrifices, and the amusing "swindles" for which Marshall was famous. Formerly titled "My Fifty Years of Chess" 13 photos. 149 diagrams. 250 pp .

Paperbound \(\$ \mathbf{\$} .35\)
Napier, W. E.
PAUL MORPHY
AND THE GOLDEN AGE OF CHESS
Chessmaster Napier brings to life the games, the men, and the times when Morphy relgned supreme. 255 diagrams. 296 pp.

SPECIAL PRICE \(\$ 3.00\)

ORDER FROM
U. S. CHESS FEDERATION

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

\title{
The Last Round by Grandmaster PAL BENKO
}

THE FOLLOWING TWO GAMES have in common the fact that they were played in the last rounds of recent tournaments.

The last round is always the most tension-filled. It is then that players try to put forth their best efforts, since it is their final chance to improve their standings in the tournament.

Last-round tension often causes players to make mistakes-as we can see in the first game presented below.

This game was played in the Greater New York Open, last December, against James T. Sherwin. Going into the final round, Sherwin was leading the tournament with five straight victories. I had already drawn a game in the previous round and so I was forced to play for a win at any cost.

\section*{KING'S INDIAN DEFENSE} Pal Benko

James T. Sherwin
\begin{tabular}{llr} 
1. & P-Q4 & N-KB3 \\
2. & P-QB4 & P-KN3 \\
3. & P-KN3 & B-N2 \\
4. & B-N2 & O-O \\
5. & N-QB3 & P-B4 \\
6. & P-Q5 & P-Q3 \\
7. & N-B3 & P-K4
\end{tabular}

More usual here is the maneuver 7. ........., N-R3 and 8. ........, N-B2, preparing for P-QN4. As Black in this position I have tried 7. ........, P-QR3 several times
and only after White replied 8. P-QR4 have I gone on to play 8. ........, P-K4. The text move makes possible the variation 8. \(\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}\), e.p., \(\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P} ; 9\). N-KN5, B \(\times \mathrm{P}\); 10 . \(\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{QN}-\mathrm{Q} 2\); 11. \(\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}\)-with good chances in return for the exchange. This line has been much analysed of late by the Russians. I decided to avoid it and keep the position closed.
\begin{tabular}{llr} 
8. & O-O & P-QR3 \\
9. & P-QR4 & N-K1 \\
10. N-K1 & P-B4 \\
11. P-K4 & P-QR4
\end{tabular}


This move closes up the queen-side, ruling out the possibility for White of playing P-QR5 followed by an eventual P-QN4. I have to admit that this continuation came as a surprise and I looked suspiciously at my opponent. As


OLD RIVALS. Grandmaster Pal Benko (left) is shown playing International Master James Sherwin at the Manhattan Chess Club in 1959. Their most recent encounter is annotated above by Mr. Benko.
far as I know, I am the originator of this system of play for Black. It's too bad that in chess one cannot copyright one's own moves! I now found myself in the unpleasant situation of having to play against my own system. Still, I had no other choice than to play the usual moves until I could find a good point at which to vary.
\begin{tabular}{lr} 
12. N-Q3 & N-R3! \\
13. P-B4 & N-N5 \\
14. PxKP & \(\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}\)
\end{tabular}

The Black Knight has arrived just in time to exchange itself for White's strong Knight on Q3, enabling Black to retain control of his K4. When I myself played all these moves for Black they didn't seem so terrific, but looking at them now from the White side, they appeared very good.
15. QxN
BxP
16. B-R6
N-N2
17. Q-Q2
B-Q2

Up to this point the game is exactly the same as Geller-Benko, Candidates' Tournament, Curacao. In that game Black played 17. ........, PxP and eventually achieved equality. With 17. ........, B-Q2, Black tries an improvement.

\section*{18. K-R1}

Q-B2
18. ........., Q-N3, with the possibility of Q-N5 looks more active.
19. QR-K1
QR-K1
20. P-N3
R-B2

The position is about equal, but Black's last is questionable. 20. ........, P-N3 or 20. ........, PxP was better. White now seizes the opportunity to exchange his inactive King's Bishop.


White now has a positional advantage. The Knight will try to get to K6 at the right moment. If Black tries for counterplay with 25 . ........, R-B6, White plays 26. Q-Q1 and the Rook is forced to retreat.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 25. & P-N3 \\
\hline 26. K-N2 & B-Q5? \\
\hline 27. B-B4! & N-K1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Losing a pawn, but Black was already in a difficult situation. If 27. ........, B-K4; 28. \(\mathrm{BxB}, \mathrm{PxB}\), White has a powerful passed pawn. Or if 28. ........, RxB, then 29. N-B6ch, K-R1; 30. Q-R6 and wins.
28. \(\mathbf{N x B P} \quad \mathrm{NPxN}\)
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
29. \(R \times N c h\) & \(R-B 1\) \\
30. \(Q-K 1\) & B-K4 \\
31. \(R \times R c h\) & KxR \\
32. \(B-Q 2\) & \(Q-N 3\)
\end{tabular}

Black momentarily defends himself by a counter-attack on the White QNP, but new difficulties await him.

\section*{33. Q.K3 \\ 34. K-B1!}

K-N1
The White King starts over to protect the QNP so that the Queen would be free to go to K1, winning the Black QRP.
34.
Q-Q1
35. K-K2
Q-B3

Black realizes White's plan and aims for active counter-play with his Queen. He succeeds through the carelessness of his opponent.

36. BxP

Too greedy. The simple 36. Q-N5! would save White from any trouble. Black obviously could not exchange Queens and after 36. ........, Q-B1 or 36 . ........, Q-B2, then 37 . BxP, threatening to exchange Queens and winning easily. With his opponent in time-pressure, White plays too carelessly and the game -which has so far been well-conductedbecomes a comedy of errors.

\section*{36. ........ \\ 37. B-Q2?}

Q-B4
37. Q-KB3 was much better.
37. ........ Q-R4ch

White overlooked this check and now compounds his error by going to the wrong square with his King.

\section*{38. K-Q3? \\ Q-Q8!}

Now the game should be drawn despite White's advantage of two pawns. The King cannot escape by K-K4 because of Q-N5ch, chasing him back. Speculating on his opponent's time-pressure, White now tries to accomplish the impossible.
\begin{tabular}{lr} 
39. P-R5I? & QxPch \\
40. K-K2 & QxPch \\
41. Q-Q3 & Q-QR5 \\
42. Q-KB3 & P-B5 \\
43. Q-N4 & Q-B7 \\
44. K-K1 & Q-N8ch \\
45. K-B2 & Q-B4ch
\end{tabular}

In bad time-pressure, Black gives the losing check. The game should be drawn after 45. \(\qquad\) Q-B7. If 45 . \(\qquad\) P-B6; 46. B-R6! and White has good winning chances.
\begin{tabular}{lr} 
46. \(Q \times Q\) & PxQ \\
47. P-R6 & B-Q5ch \\
48. K -K2 & P-B6 \\
49. BxP & .......
\end{tabular}

And, in this lost position, Black overstepped the time limit.

The next game was played in the crucial last round of the recent United States Championship. The field was so closely bunched together that I could finish anywhere from second to sixth, depending on the results of the last round. My position in the tournament dictated my strategy: try to win, but keep a draw in hand!

\section*{CATALAN SYSTEM}

Pal Benko
Edmar Mednis
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { 1. } & \text { P-Q4 } \\ \text { 2. } & \text { N-KB3 } \\ \text { 3. } & \text { P-KN3 }\end{array}\)
N-KB3
P-K3
White prepares for a long positional struggle, avoiding the better-known continuations.
\begin{tabular}{llr} 
3. & & \\
4. & B-N2 & P-Q4 \\
5. & O-O & B-K2 \\
6. & P-B4 & O.O
\end{tabular}

Black builds up a solid defensive position in the classical style. The value of Black's opening strategy has gone up recently on the international chess stock exchange. The only problem Black has left is the development of his Queen's Bishop.


I have played this move successfully on several occasions, notably against Darga in the Varna Olympiad, 1962. Even Petrosian employed this move against Botvinnik in the recent world championship match, a fact which increased my confidence in it. White's idea is that if Black tries to develop with the natural 8. . ........, P-QN3, there follows 9. PxP, BPxP and White has lasting pressure on the open Queen-Bishop file.

\section*{8. N-R4!}

Cutting the Gordian knot! Black finds a direct solution to his problem. It is interesting to note that no one seems to have thought of this move before. Allowing the Bishop to be exchanged did not look promising for White, nor did retreating, unless he would be satisfied with a draw.
\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text { 9. } & \text { B-Q2 } & \text { N/4-B3 } \\
\text { 10. } & \text { R-B1 } & \text { P.QR4! }
\end{array}
\]

Again an excellent move. Black is preparing 11. ........, P-QN3, to develop his Bishop safely at R3.

\section*{11. B-B4}

N-R4
Black refuses to let this Bishop live in peace. White now rejects the seeming. ly good 12. P-B5 because of 12 . NxB; 13. PxN, P-QN3! 14. PxP, QxP; 15. QxP, QxNP.

\section*{12. B-K3}

A questionable move, provoking a Black king-side attack. But what can White do to avoid a draw after 12. B-Q2, N/4-B3? After 13. N-B3, P-QN3 or even 13. ........, PxP would be good for Black.
12.
P.KB4
13. B-Q2
14. B-K1
K-R1

At last the Bishop has found a modest retreat where he cannot be disturbed, after so many unsuccessful tries.
\begin{tabular}{lr} 
14. & B-W3 \\
15. N -B3 & P-KN4 \\
16. P-K3 & Q-B3 \\
17. Q-K2 & Q-R3
\end{tabular}

So far Black has conducted the Kingside advance well, but here 17. Q-N3 was indicated so as not to block the RP. White immediately takes advantage of this seemingly small but basically important inaccuracy.

\section*{18. P-KR4!}

PxP
After 18. ........., P-N5; 19. N-R2, the King-side would be closed and Black would have no more attacking chances.
\begin{tabular}{lr} 
19. \(\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{RP}\) & \(\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 2\) \\
20. \(\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3\) & \(\mathrm{~N} / 4-\mathrm{B} 3\) \\
21. Q-Q3 & \(\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 5\) \\
22. \(\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 2\) & \(\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 4\) \\
23. \(\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 4\) & \(\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3\) \\
24. \(\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}\) & \(\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{N}\) \\
25. \(\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 1!\) & \(\ldots . .\).
\end{tabular}

The beginning of an unusual maneuver. It would be difficult for White to operate on the king-side because of the unsafe position of his own king. On the other hand, it would take too much time to work out a concrete threat on the queen-side. So White aims to march his King to the queen-side in order to get a free hand on the king-side and in the center. A brave decision-since the position is far from closed.


Preventing Black from opening the queen-bishop file with 29. ........, P-QB4.

\section*{29. \\ 30. Q-K2}

B-B2
White is preparing to meet 30.
P-K4. Obviously for Black to win a pawn with 30. ........, BxN; 31. KPxB, QxQP; 32. P-B3 would be dangerous.
\begin{tabular}{lr} 
30. ...... & P-K4 \\
31. PxP & BxP \\
32. N-Q3 & B-B3 \\
33.QR-N1 & P-R5 \\
34. B-N4 & QR-K1
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{lr}
\text { 35. } \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B4} & \text { B-K4 } \\
\text { 36. } \mathrm{N} \text {-R5 } & \text { Q-N5! }
\end{array}
\]
\begin{tabular}{lr} 
37. B-KB3 & Q-N4 \\
38. R-Q1 & B-K3 \\
39. \(N\)-B4 & B-KB2 \\
40. QR-B1 & R-Q1 \\
41. K-N1 & KR-K1
\end{tabular}

After both sides had been in timepressure for the last ten moves, Black sealed this passive move. After 41. P-Q5, opening up the position, there would still be a lot of fight left. With his King in safety at last, White begins the decisive liquidation.
\begin{tabular}{lr} 
42. \(B \times N\) & QPxB \\
43. \(B \cdot B 3\) & BxB \\
44. \(R \times B\) & Q-N1 \\
45. \(R \cdot R 3!\) & .......
\end{tabular}


A cunning move, tempting Black to check. 48. QxP would be a mistake because of 48 . \(\qquad\) R-Q7; 49. Q-N4, RxP; 50. Q-B3ch, Q-N2 and White cannot take the Bishop because of mate.
48.

B-Q6ch
49. RxB !

RxR
Black couldn't play 49. ........, PxR, because of 50. Q-B3ch, Q-N2; 51. QxQch, KxQ; 52. N-K6ch and wins.
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
50. NxR & PxN \\
51. Q-B3ch & Q-N2 \\
52. K-B1! & .......
\end{tabular}

Gaining a vital tempo. If Black now plays 52. ........, K-N1, there follows: 53. QxQch, KxQ; 54. K-Q2, K-B3; 55. KxP, K-K4; 56. P-QN4, PxP, e.p.; 57. PxP, K-Q4; 58. P-QN4 and wins.
\begin{tabular}{lr} 
52. \(\ldots \ldots .\). & QxQch \\
53. P×Q & K-N2 \\
54. K-Q2 & K-B3 \\
55. K×P & K-K4 \\
56. P-QB4 & P-R4 \\
57. P-B4ch & Resigns
\end{tabular}

Plan NOW
to play in the U.S. OPEN IN BOSTON
AUGUST 16-29

\title{
GAMES BY USCF MEMBERS
}

Annotated
by USCF MASTER JOHN W. COLLINS

\section*{JEFFREY HARRIS}

High school student Jeffrey Harris of Philadelphia finished third, only half a point behind Irwin and Zelitch. A pupil of the late Attilio DiCamillo, who also taught former women's champion Lisa Lane, Jeffrey played strong chess and went home with three trophies (third place, under-16, and high school).

\section*{NIMZO-INDIAN DEFENSE}
\begin{tabular}{llrllr} 
J. Cooper & & & \multicolumn{2}{r}{ J. Harris } \\
1. & P-Q4 & N-KB3 & 5. & B-Q3 & O-O \\
2. & P-QB4 & P-K3 & 6. & N-B3 & P-Q4 \\
3. & N-QB3 & B-N5 & 7. & O-O & N-B3 \\
4. & P-K3 & P-B4 & & &
\end{tabular}

Evans-Reshevsky, U. S. Championship, New York, 1963, had 7. ........, PxBP; 8. BxP, QN-Q2.
8. P-QR3
BxNch
9. PxB Q-B2

Normal in this Normal Variation is 9. ........, QPxP; 10. BxP, Q-B2.

\section*{10. Q-B2}
10. P-QR4 and 10. BPxP may be better.
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
10. ....... & QPxP \\
11. BxP & P-K4!
\end{tabular}

A key, equalizing move.
12. \(\mathrm{NxP} \quad \mathrm{NxN}\) 14. B-Q3 R-KI 13. \(P \times N\) QxP 15. P-QB4? ........

Although this does not lose the QR , it does involve a dire weakening of the K-side. Taimanov gives 15. P-B3! B-K3; 16. P-KB4! Q-R4; 17. P-B4.

\section*{15. ........ N-N5!}

If 15. ........, QxR? 16. B-N2, QxRch (16. ........, Q-R7? 17. Q-B3! and 18. B-N1) 17. KxQ , with advantage to White.

\section*{16. P-N3}

If 16. P-B4? QxR; 17. B-N2, NxKP; 18. Q-B3, QxB; 19. QxQ, NxR; 20. KxN, P-QN3 with advantage to Black. And 16. BxPch?? K-R1 17. P-N3, Q-R4 costs the KB.
\begin{tabular}{lrll} 
16. & Q-.... & Q-R4 & 18. B-K4 \\
17. & B-R 64
\end{tabular}

Not 19. BxP?? N-B6ch and Black mates or wins the KR.
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
19. & \\
20. P-B3 & B-N5 \\
21. P-B4 & B-R6 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


This is much stronger than going into an ending with 21. ...., QxQ; 22. RxQ, NxP; 23. BxP, QR-N1; 24. B-B6.

\section*{22. Q-B2 \\ N-B3 \\ 23. B-KN2 \\ QR-Q1}

White should finish developing with 24. B-Q2, 25. QR-K1, and 26. B-QB3. 24. BxN would leave the light squares too weakened.
24.

N-Q5!?
It is not quite clear why the QNP is offered and refused.

\section*{25. P-K4?}

If 25. PxN?? R-K7 wins the Queen.
But the text move loses the QBP and lets in the Bishop. Several fairly good moves are available-25. R-K1, 25. R-R2, 25. B-N2, and 25. BxP.
\begin{tabular}{lr} 
25. ...... & B-K7 \\
26. R-K1 & B-Q6 \\
27. R-K3 & \(\ldots . .\). \\
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
of a trap \(\ldots\). & \\
27.
\end{tabular} &
\end{tabular}

Sanest. If 27. ........, N-B7; 28. RxB! NxR (28. ........, RxR? 29. QxN) 29. RQB3! and the Knight is embarrassed.
28. B-N2 N-N6
31. R/3-K1 Q-QN3
29. B-KB3 Q-R3
30. R-Q1 N-Q5
32. R-N1
B-Q6

White gets two Pawns for the exchange, but it is not enough, as he starts with a pawn-minus. 33. QR-B1 causes more difficulty.
\begin{tabular}{lr} 
33. \(\ldots \ldots .\). & BxR \\
34. & \\
35. \(\operatorname{BxP}\) & Q-N6 \\
& R-Q6
\end{tabular}

The Rooks now perform their deadly tasks.
36. B-K3 R-QB1

Threatening 37. ........, R/1-B6.
37. B-K2

And White resigns, seeing his QB is en prise. Actually, 37. B-N2 is the only way to avoid losing a piece and then R/1-B6 38. B-QB1, (38. B-Q2, R-B7) RxP wins easily for Black.

\section*{U.S. Junior Championship}
for the John W. Collins Trophy
AUGUST 10-14, 1964
To be played at Towson Teachers College, Baltimore, Md.
Prizes:
1st., \$100 scholarship
2nd., \$ 50 scholarship plus trophies for top finishers.

\section*{Entry fee: \(\$ 5.00\) plus USCF Membership}

For entries and inquiries:
ROBERT ERKES
3413 Dennlyn Road
Baltimore 15, Md.

\title{
MY GAMES FROM CHICAGO
}

\author{
by U. S. Open Champion WILLIAM LOMBARDY
}

CHESS LIFE continues its presentation of all the games played by Grandmaster William Lombardy at the 1963 United States Open in Chicago. The first four games appeared in our March issue.


\section*{Round 5}

Resorting to irregular openings can be a steely weapon in the hands of the experienced veteran. Add to this the fact that one's adversary is a skilled and tried tactician, an obvious fact if you have seen Mr. Quillen engaged in ten-second Chess, and you may be sure a battle of some proportions will follow. Fortunately for me, my worthy rival also showed signs of being overanxious, a point on which I was able to capitalize.

\section*{White: W. Lombardy Black: Paul Quillen RUY LOPEZ}
1. P-K4, P-K4; 2. N-KB3, N-QB3; 3. B-N5, P-QR3; 4. B-R4, P-Q3; 5. P-B3, B-Q2; 6. P.Q4, Q-B3?!

Not accustomed to encountering such a move in serious, perhaps I should say orthodox, tournament play, I was momentarily startled. I hesitated some while, instinctively. To make impetuous moves against the irregular is the surest way to disaster. I thought awhile; the move definitely had merit. Not finding an immediate and crushing refutation, I prodded myself to move in my own orthodox manner.
7. O-O, P-KR3; 8. P-Q5, N-N1; 9. P-B4, P-KN4.

The key to Black's plan, a pawn wedge to clear the way for his attacking force on the king side. The one drawback is the weakening of his own White squares; how significant this is shall be seen.
10. N-B3, N-K2; 11. N-K1, N-N3; 12. BxBch, NxB; 13. Q-N4, ........ .

This move helps magnify the flaw in the Black structure, the poorly quarded White squares. This factor enables White to parry easily any aggressive overtures.
13. ........, B-K2; 14. P-KN3,

This move is playable since Black cannot coordinate his pieces with any alacrity to pull off an assault along the king rook file.
14. Q-N2.
The endgame is the more prudent choice, especially since it is open to question whether the Black weaknesses are fatal: 14. \(\qquad\) P-KR4; 15. Q-B5, QxQ; 16. PxQ, KN-B1; 17. N-K4, R-KN1; 18. N-Q3, N-R2 followed by QN-B3. White gambled on 13 . Q-N4, instead of properly proceeding with \(\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 2-\mathrm{K} 3\), in the hope of discouraging Black from castling Q, immediately. He succeeded.
15. Q-B5, N-B3.

Black ought to castle Q -side immediately in order to commence king-side action.
16. N-N2, B-Q1; 17. Q-B3

Withdrawing the queen from any possibility of danger and preparing to occupy KB5 with a knight.
17. ........, B-K2; 18. N-K3, N-R2; 19. P-QN4!,

Black's commitment to queen side castling gives White the signal to prepare a break in that sector. Meanwhile, Black cannot make any headway on the king side without great loss of time in patient preparation or, the alternative, sacrificing a pawn.
19. ........, P-KR4; 20. N-B5, Q-B3; 21. QxP, O-O-O; 22. Q-K2,

The knight at KB5 hampers all enemy operations. Black tries to eliminate this pest, but to do so, he must temporarily ignore White's queen side push.
22. ........, QR-N1; 23. P-B3, B-Q1; 24. R-B2, N-K2; 25. NxNch, QxN.

Success is much a fleeting commodity; White quickly brings up reenforcements.
26. N-Q1, N-B3; 27. N-K3, Q-Q2; 28. N-N4!, .........


Curious that the knight is even more effective on this square, since it performs the dual role of defending KR2 and pestering Black's knight. White welcomes an exchange to open the KB file.
28.
........, N-R4; 29. P-B5, ........
Late in coming but quite powerful. With Black's king-side play at a standstill, there is not much chance of holding the queen-side against superior force.
29. ........, Q-R5; 30. R-N1!,

By a simple exchange, White intends to remove Black's only defender in the area of attack.
30. ........, N-N2; 31. Q-B2,

Under pressure of attack, exchanges usually bring relief. This is the exception to the rule, for here the exchange gives added vehemence to the storm.
31.
........, QxQ; 32. RxQ, K-N1; 33. P-N5!, .........
Simple addition, two rooks and a bishop against a lone king and his bishop.
33. ........, P-QR4; 34. P-N6, N-K1; 35. PxPch, BxP; 36. P-B6. Black resigns. Since, if: 36. ........, P-N3; 37. B-K3, K-R2; 38. \(\mathrm{R}(2)-\mathrm{N} 2\) with mate inevitable.

\section*{Round 6}

This game is of importance for opening theory. Both players were in a fighting mood; so the game promised to be exciting. Black's early sacrifice of a pawn seemingly accomplished nothing, but White, unwilling to take the evident risks involved in playing for the win, offered the draw.

\section*{White: Robert Byrne \\ Black: W. Lombardy KING'S INDIAN DEFENSE}
(Irregular Yugoslav Variation)
1. P-Q4, N-KB3; 2. P-QB4, P-KN3; 3. P-KN3, B-N2; 4. B-N2, O-O; 5. N-QB3, P-B4.

This move was played with the intention of making the sacrifice which follows at the ninth turn. Since Bob is known to specialize in the White side of this opening, the secondary purpose was to steer away from possible prepared lines; as is clear from the game, this attempt was not altogether successful.
6. P-Q5, P-Q3; 7. N-R3?1, .........

Ordinarily this move would have come as a surprise, but

I had seen Bob experiment with it in rapid transit play (ten seconds per move). A highly original idea with quite some merit.
7. ........, N-R3; 8. N-B4, N-B2; 9. O-O, P-QN4.

Under consideration was 9. ........, P-QR3; 10. P-QR4, P-QN3; 11. R-QN1 and White seems to get in P-QN4 first. Apparently Black can achieve no more than equality after 11. ........, R-N1; 12. P-N4, N-Q2; 13. B-Q2, PxP; 14. RxP, P-QR4; 15. R-N1, N-K4; 16. Q-N3, QB-R3; 17. N-N5. In fact, White holds a slight initiative.
10. PxP, R-N1; 11. P-QR4,

There is a maxim that when one returns a gambit pawn he then attains equality. This case is one of the exceptions to the rule. Should White casually return the pawn, he would find himself with the inferior position-thus P-QR4. 11. \(\qquad\) P-QR3; 12. PxP, BxP; 13. R-QN1,


Has Black been too ambitious? His only compensation is the fact that the White knight may be considered misplaced at KB4, plus the fact that he controls a few queen side squares. He must make the most of this. 13.
........, P-B5!; 14. P.QN4!, PxP, e.p.; 15. RxP, B-B5!
As long as White's king rook and knight cannot conveniently reach the queen side, he can do nothing with the extra pawn. Black does his utmost to prevent those pieces from coming into play and logically plans to eliminate by exchanges those pieces that are already in play in that sector.
16. R-R3, N-R3; 17. N-Q3, Q-R4; 18. B-Q2, Q-B2; 19. R-K1, N-B4 and the draw was agreed upon.

White's best course is to return the pawn: 20 . N-N5, BxN; 21. \(\mathrm{PxB}, \mathrm{RxP}\); after which series of moves the game is quite even. Complicated play, somewhat favoring Black, results after 20. B-K3, N-N5; 21. BxN, PxB; when Black's better development, the two bishops and the strong passed pawn more than compensate for the sacrificed pawn. A legitimate grandmaster draw!

\section*{Round 7}

Black is overanxious to capitalize on White's double pawn weakness on the QB file. Subsequently, he neglects his development, similarly weakens his own pawns on the queen side and finally surrenders a pawn in order to escape the bind in which he finds himself. To this very pawn does he succumb.

\section*{White: W. Lombardy Black: Angelo Sandrin SICILIAN DEFENSE}
1. P-K4, P.QB4; 2. N-KB3, N-QB3; 3. P-Q4, PxP; 4. NxP, N-B3; 5. N-QB3, P-K3; 6. B-K3,

In an earlier round with Black in the same variation Sandrin had lost to Gligorich, who essayed 6. KN-N5, B-N5; 7. P-QR3, BxNch; 8. NxB, P-Q4; 9. PxP, PxP; 10. B-Q3, O-0 resulting in an even position which Black lost only after several mishaps. The text here is much more risky than 6. KN-N5.
6. ........, B-N5!; 7. B-Q3, P-Q4!; 8.PxP, NxP?!

Black could also play 8 \(\qquad\) QxP; 9. O-0, Q.Q1; with a playable game.

\section*{9. \(\mathrm{NxN}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{N}\).}

Black has two other logical choices:
I.) 9. ........, NxN; 10. NxQ, NxQ dis. ch; 11. KxN, KxN; 12. P-QB4 and White is slightly better.
II.) 9. ........, NxB; 10. NxQ, NxQ; 11. RxQ, BxNch (an eventual must); 12. PxB, KxN; 13. BxP dis. ch, K-B2; 14. B-Q3 and
here again White is better, but the win should prove very difficult.
10. B-Q2, NxN ; 11. PxN, B-K2; 12. Q-N4!

In effect White is a pawn behind, but his superior development gives him compensation in the form of immediate threats.
12. ........, B-B3; 13. O-O, Q-B2.

This is a waste of time. Correct would be the more active sacrifice of a pawn: 13. ........, O-O; 14. Q-K4, P-KN3; 15. QxBP, B-Q2; 16. Q-N7, Q-B1. As the game goes, Black's heroic efforts to hold the QB pawn result in his being enmeshed in a hopeless bind.
14. Q-K4, B-Q2; 15. QR-NI, P-KN3; 16. B-KB4, Q-R4; 17. R-N7, Q-Q4; 18. P-QB4!!, .........


Apparently Black had not forseen this retort; else he positively would have sacrificed the pawn at move thirteen. 18. ........, \(Q \times Q\) 19. \(B x Q, P-K 4\).

The impending R-Q1 cannot be parried. The winning technique is instructive.
20. B-K3, R-QB1; 21. BxRP, ........ .

Ironic that White should win on the queen side.
21. ........, B-K3; 22. B-QB5, B-Q1; 23. R-Q1, P-B4.

Were it White's move, that is, had Black not played P-KB4, White would have won immediately with R-N8!, RxR by Black, then BxPch and mate next.
24. B-Q3, P-K5; 25. B-B1, B-QB2; 26. P-QR4, R-KN1; 27. P-R5, R-N2; 28. P-R6, R-Q2; 29. RxR, KxR; 30. B-N6, P-B4; 31. P-R7, Black resigns.

\section*{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.
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\title{
by U. S. Senior Master ELIOT HEARST
}


\section*{Books, Bronstein, and Zurich}

Since Reuben Fine put away his chess pen several years ago, there have been almost no outstanding books on chess published in the U.S.A. One CL reader recently asked, "Is it impossible to get a good book on chess published here?" Numerous other correspondents have complained about the superficiality, monotony, and lack of originality of most recent American offerings on chess. Other readers have seriously taken up the study of Russian, German, or Dutch, not in order to prepare for their summer vacations in Europe, but to be able to study and appreciate the mass of instructional material and tournament books that are continually being published overseas.

One of the underlying reasons for the poverty of American chess literature is the commercial success of the books by you-know-who and the resulting belief among publishers that a book which caters to the virtual beginner or to the uncritical club player is the only kind of book that will "sell" in this country. I find it hard to believe that this opinion is accurate. Maybe the following experiment will reveal the true psyche of the chess reader.

Some months ago, Burt Hochberg of the Manhattan Chess Club trapped his fellow clubmate, Oscar Freedman-who has long been known to have the strongest handshake of any chessplayer in New York-into translating some Russian passages from ex-world championship challenger David Bronstein's book on the Challengers' Tourney at Zurich in 1953. This was the tournament from which Smyslov qualified to meet Botvinnik for the world title, ahead of Bronstein, Keres, Reshevsky, Petrosian, Geller, Najdorf, Kotov, Taimanov, Averbakh, Boleslavsky, Szabo, Gligoric, Euwe, and Stahlberg. Since its initial publication in 1956 Bronstein's book has been referred to all over the chess world as a masterpiece of exposition and analysis, as well as one of the best books on the middlegame ever written-even though it is cast in the form of a tournament book. The first Russian edition was soon out of print and Bronstein just recently put out a revised second edition, so far as I know the first time a second, expanded version of a chess tournament book has ever been required by public demand.

To make a long story short, Freedman became immediately aware of the value of the work and its superiority to almost anything else he had ever read. Now, together with Hochberg, he has just about finished a translation of the entire volume, which includes commentary on the entire 208 games played in the event. Unfortunately, however, the American chess publishers and editorial consultants whom Hochberg and Freedman have approached are reluctant to recommend publication of the work, apparently because of a feeling that a meaty volume like this one will not sell. Perhaps a concerted effort by the readers of CL can exert influence on some enlightened publisher.

Following are the introductory remarks and preface to Bronstein's book, which ought to give readers some idea of the flavor of the work. Every reader who would like to see this book, or books of this type, made available in English in the U.S.A. ought to drop a card to Burt Hochberg, 574 West End Ave., N.Y., N.Y. 10024, or to me and let us know about it. Chessreaders of the U.S.A., unite!

\section*{International Tournament of Grandmasters Zurich 1953}

Written by David Bronstein Translated from the Russian by Oscar D. Freedman Copyright by Burt Hochberg

\section*{Introductory Remarks}

In starting to work on my first book on chess, I put myself mentally in the reader's place, and I recalled my emotions when I came across every new book on chess, hoping to find therein living thoughts, clear words, and tales of the beauty of chess. Books taught me a great deal, and to date I remember the best of them with gratitude.

Books on chess tournaments belong to a peculiar type of literature. At first glance, the author's creative possibilities appear somewhat limited, since he is forced to write about something definite, not created by him: already-prepared chess material. However, such is not the case. The author can discuss the games played, summarize them, and point out the ideas and plans actually applied as
well as those which might have taken place in this or the other game.

A compilation of games from an important tournament is not just a miscellany. If the participants in the event are the strongest players in world, then their games have a definite interconnection; they abound in ideas which crystallize and develop as the tournament progresses, while the competition as a whole reflects a definite stage in the development of chess thought. Such were the tournaments of Hastings 1895, St. Petersburg 1914, New York 1944, Moscow 1935, and Groningen 1946. No doubt, the Zurich tournament belongs among these competitions.

While working on the book, I proceeded in the belief that each completed game is a work of art created by two masters of the same class. The nucleus of a chess game is a creative combat of intentions, a struggle of chess ideas which reach the greatest heights in the middle of the game.

This book analyzes a number of typical positions which arise as a result of the clashing of plans; it discusses certain strategic concepts: the relative power of the pieces, defensive phases, the weakness of the black squares, the superiority of the two bishops, etc.; also discussed are such elements of the struggle as intuition, resourcefulness, and stability.

The games culled from a grandmasters' tournament bring the reader into the creative circle of contemporary chess leaders; they show how the battle is joined and the manner in which a

\section*{CHESS LIFE ANNUALS 1961-1962-1963}
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> New York 3, N.Y.
work of chess art is actually produced. The author wanted to discuss the most interesting and least explored phase of a chess game-the middlegame-and the way it is played by grandmasters today. This is the basic aim of the book.

The author tried not to overload the book with variations. Variations are interesting if they reveal the beauty of chess; they are useless if they go beyond the limits of man's capacity to calculate; they are harmful if an attempt is made to substitute them for the study and elucidation of such positions in which the outcome of the struggle is decided by intuition, imagination, talent.

At the same time I should like to see that the chessplayer who reads this book reaches a higher level of practical chess strength.

The reader will see errors in the tournament games, but he will not condemn the master too harshly if he will realize the peculiarities of the chess struggle. Behind the board sits a living man with today's thoughts and experiences, many times removed from chess. While deciding upon an overall plan of play, or even only on the next move, he ponders involuntarily over his standing in the tournament, recalls the result of yesterday's game, looks at the boards of the other players. A game is not analysis; everything has to be figured out in the mind without moving the pieces; the textbook cannot be consulted, there is no one to ask for advice. The grandmaster reflects, glances at the clock for the last timetime to decide. He risks! The knight is moved to K5. It is easy enough, a year later, after becoming acquainted with all the analysis, having sat with the position for days, to tell the reader authoritatively: "An error; best was the careful N-K1."

I tender my work to the reader with apprehension, and I shall consider my aim successfully accomplished if the book as a whole will broaden his chess understanding, add to his mastery, give him an idea of today's chess creativeness, and enable him to more fully evaluate and to love even more all the depths of chess.

\section*{PREFACE}

Inasmuch as this book is dedicated basically to the middle phase of the game, it would be timely to begin with a few words about the evolution of opening ideas and about contemporary opening repertory.

In the earlier years, say in the second half of the last century, games were usually started by moving the King's Pawn, and Black usually replied P-K4. There were also, of course, such defenses as the Sicilian and the French, but they were relatively rare. With a few exceptions, not less than one-half of the games played in tournaments were of the open type, sometimes many more. Toward the end of the last century and at the beginning of the present one, there was a sharp increase in leanings toward the closed openings for White and to the semi-open for Black. Thus, in Cambridge Springs, in 1904, the

Queen's Gambit stood in first place, the Ruy Lopez in second, and the Sicilian in third. In tournaments of the 1890s and 1900 s, the Indian defenses made their appearance-the first swallows of a new spring.

The most important tournaments of the '20s are known for the almost complete disappearance of open games, with the exception of the Ruy Lopez; the Queen's Gambit and the Queen's pawn openings prevailed. Along with this, White's successes with the Queen's Gambit and the Ruy Lopez gradually brought about the popularity of the asymmetrical systems of defense-the Indian against P-Q4, and the Sicilian against P-K4. The victories of the younger grandmasters were connected with the discoveries of new openings-the Nimzovich Defense, Reti's Opening, the Gruenfeld Defense, and Alekhine's Defense.

In the great double-round tournament in Bled (1931), in which Alekhine, Bogoljubov, Nimzovich, Vidmar, Flohr, Tartakover, Spielmann, Maroczy, and others participated, the Queen's Gambit and the Queen's Pawn openings were played 77 times; White won 29 and Black 13. Of the Indian defenses, in 21 games, White won only 2 , and Black won 14 . Is there any wonder that in the next stage of development in the '30s and ' 40 s , there were fewer and fewer adherents of the Queen's Gambit? The successes of many Soviet and foreign chess players are closely connected with the development and creation of the new systems in the Indian and Sicilian Defenses, and also in the Nimzovich and Gruenfeld Defenses. In our time, the opening structures for White and Black can be broken down into three basic groups.
1. In the first, both sides act according to classical principles-the development of the pieces, the seizure of space, the formation of a pawn center, the absence of weaknesses, etc. This is the character of the majority of the variations of the Queen's Gambit, the Ruy Lopez, the French Defense and a few systems of the Sicilian and Nimzovich Defenses. Even so, Black realizes that in these cases, especially in symmetrical set-ups, the initial move confers superiority, and Black will be called upon to struggle long and patiently to achieve equality. Chances to win are slight, but with careful play there is a draw in the offing. Typical of these openings was the result of the match for the World Championship between J. R. Capablanca and A. A. Alekhine. Of the 34 games played, 33 were started with the Queen's pawn: 25 were drawn, six were won with White, and two with Black. In our time, the masters are not too willing to go into these openings; they refuse the symmetrical set-ups, trying to find defenses with counter-chances.
2. In the second group of openings, one side is guided by classical principles, whereas the other deliberately plays to refute some of them in order to bring about complications. These are the basic systems of the Indian Defenses, the Si-
cilian Defense, the Nimzovich Defense, the Gruenfeld Defense, and a few sharp forcing variations of the Queen's Gambit.
3. To the third group may be assigned the openings in which White, in the initial phase, does not attempt to seize, but merely control, the central squares; he does not determine the pawn formation too early, maintaining maximum flexibility and preparing for maneuvering play. White is ready at the proper time to go in for complications, and if successful, to bring his positional advantage to the technical stage. This group includes the closed system of the Sicilian Defense, a number of variations of the Reti Opening, the King's Indian for White, the English Opening, and a few others.

It is important to note that the name of the opening does not predetermine the character of the opening play. For instance, in the Queen's Gambit, one may play the Orthodox System, a typical example of a battle along classical lines, or one may choose Botvinnik's system, or the risky "Peruvian" variation, with forced play and with counter-chances for Black. The Queen's Indian, though not one of the symmetrical openings, still does not yield Black any real counterchances. In the Nimzovich Defense, one of the most remarkable discoveries of the "hypermoderns" of the '20s, flexible transpositions to positional themes or to sharp variations are possible; the system possesses great vitality.

The modifications of opening fashions took place in close relationship with the general development of chess ideas. The greatest prevalence of the Queen's Gambit is related to the period when the principles of the positional school held sway. Given all the positive significance of these principles, one must note their one great shortcoming: the evaluation of a position by outward signs. In the eyes of the followers of Tarrasch, the propagandist of Steinitz' ideas, such factors as a backward pawn, or a strong pawn center, or superiority in development, were decisive in the evaluation of a position and the formulation of a plan of battle. "If one piece is badly posted, the whole game is bad" says Tarrasch. The principles of the positional school, clothed by Tarrasch in simple and easily understood form, were accepted by many contemporaries as immutable chess dogma. It is here that the idea of the so-called "consistent" games were born, games in which one of the opponents conducts his logical plan from beginning to end on the style of a geometric theorem, an idea which still survives.

> The May Issue of CHESS LIFE
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In the treatment of these "ideal" games, one opponent parades as the follower of the principles, and the other as the transgressor. And so the "good" opponent keeps piling up positional advantages, putting them away in a savings account, to buy, say, a motorcycle, and having accumulated the necessary amount, he throws himself into a combinational attack and administers an instructive mate, or still more instructive wins the Exchange. The question arises, what was his adversary doing all this time? He was good-naturedly observing his backward pawns, his poorly placed pieces, making helpless gestures, and finally, "Black resigns".

Is it necessary to state that such games do not occur between grandmasters of equal strength, and that the annotators, none other than the winners of these games, depict the desirable as the actual?

This philosophy of the positional school dominated the chess world for a long time, but in the '20s, their weaknesses were finally revealed. As the Queen's Gambit was gradually squeezed out of the list of openings, the highest places of the tournament tables bore the names of Nimzovich, Reti, Tartakover, and other masters who stood up openly against the one-sided and exaggerated views of positional principles.

From about 1935 on, there appeared on the chess horizon, headed by Botvinnik, the young masters of our land, who later on occupied first places among the world's chess players. The comraderie and steady successes of the Soviet chess players created the impression in some minds that the Soviet school of chess was the sum total of homogeneity of ideas and concepts of chess. It seems to me that such is not the case. Indeed, in the family of Soviet chess masters, chess players of differing styles get along. For instance, Spassky and Petrosian, by their manner of play, and by their conception of chess, differ from each other no less than Spielmann and Schlechter, and Tal differs from Botvinnik no less than Lasker from Capablanca.

What then, are the characteristic ideas of the '50s? What contribution has the tournament in Switzerland made to the development of ideas? Whither the further course of progress in chess?

Let us note the great knowledge possessed by chess players who have been nourished on the experience of previous generations, which enables them to conduct the struggle with great courage, cleverness, imagination and risk-and all this on the basis of a sober evaluation of the pluses and minuses of the contemplated operation.

The scope of positional play has grown up immensely. If Tarrasch had taught to avoid weaknesses in one's camp, and to create weaknesses for one's opponent, to accumulate small advantages, to occupy open lines, not to resort to an attack without proper pre-paration-at present everything is done
very much differently. One creates weak points and weak pawns to divert the opponent, one gives away open files in order to keep the Rooks for other, more promising plans, one demonstrates a quasi-desire to attack in order to disguise his real intentions.
The network of typical basic positions upon which every chess player more or less depends has grown immensely. And so it developed that many positions previously considered lost can now be successfully, even actively defended, but this requires, firstly, tense calculated play, and secondly, the ability, in a critical moment, to throw a weak point to the winds, and to 0 dransfer the struggle to another sector. Only now does it become clear that this very manner of fighting was characteristic of Emanuel Lasker's style, and this constituted his basic advantage, not understood by any of his contemporaries.

However, this was not the only trait of Lasker, the greatest psychologist in chess. He could, like nobody else, swing the pendulum of a chess battle to right and left, without overstepping the safety zone, yet imperceptibly pushing his opponent into the abyss. He deliberately made second-best moves as if inviting his opponent to mete out the punishment. Now this style has been explored and perfected. Contemporary chess players are ready from the first to concede the opponent superficial positional superiorities.

An illustration of this can be seen in the position which occurs in the King's Indian, in the continuation of KPxP for Black, and also in a group of positions after 1. P-Q4, N-KB3; 2. P-QB4, P-B4; 3. P-Q5, P-K3; 4. N-QB3, PxP; 5. PxP. Boleslavsky's system in the Sicilian Defense, with a gaping hole on Q4 and a hopelessly backward pawn on Q3, appears to be uncalled-for impudence, yet it has withstood all its trials. Many similar examples are found in the book.

The reader will also find here a description of technical methods and means used by contemporary masters in the middle game. The conception of a technical method is much greater than it was ten years ago. What appeared before to be a rarity, a find, has now become the property of the masses.

Without technique, mastery is not possible in any art; the same is true of chess.
However, one ought not exaggerate the importance of technique in chess. The endgame about which we often hear, "it is now a matter of technique", is quite often far from being a clear and easy task. The strongest chess player some thirty years ago from the standpoint of technique, was Capablanca; in our times it is V. Smyslov. In analysing the socalled technical games and endings of Capablanca and Smyslov, I came to the conclusion that they are based on combinational elements and upon longrange and precise figuring; consequently, it is an unusual, a superior, technique. The same holds true, more or less, in
the endings of many grandmasters. I shall mention here only two in the Zurich touranment-Euwe vs. Stahlberg and Gligorich vs. Euwe.
There is one more trait of contemporary art which the reader will often notice in the games of the Swiss tourna-ment-the readiness to react quickly to the opponent's change of plan, and to sharply modify one's own plan if there is a real basis for modification.
Doubtless, one of the brightest and most promising tendencies which appeared during the course of the tournament was the desire to veer, at the first opportunity, to open play with the pieces. Apparently, Morphy's style exerts an irresistible magnetic power for players of all times, and the return to a style of the highest degree is the dream of every chess player, not excluding even the grandmasters. It seems to me that we are nearer to it now than we ever were in the last hundred years.

The new trend, the representatives of which are insistently making inroads in the USSR championships, in the Interzonal tournaments of 1955 and 1958 and the candidates' Tournament of 1959, is characterized by the desire to change the battle from the logical phase into the combinational, or, more precisely, into the calculative stage. The material consideration-a pawn more, an Exchange less-hardly matters here. Proof of the soundness of the combinations in all variations is not required. Rather, the opposite. In most cases it appears that the attacked side could defend, provided the "only" moves could be found. But here the grandmaster of the new movement depends upon himself, upon his phenomenal ability to figure out an untold multiplicity of long and complex variations.
It is then that the contours of the game take on at times the strangest forms. One postional master said in great seriousness, "I battled him (the master of the calculative style) for 32 moves and did not predict any of his replies, except one, when he had to take the Queen."
The brightest stars of the dynamic style today are, without doubt, Grandmasters Mikhail Tal and Boris Spassky. Of course, the method of complicating the game, and the transition into the calculative battle is not the only weapon of these extraordinarily endowed and many-sided chess players. They have a perfect command of the technique of positional play, they are brilliant in the endgame, they know the openings well, and they excel the other masters precisely in their ability to lend the game a dynamic character, to transfer
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\section*{The Lure of Correspondence Chess}

\section*{by HANS J. BERLINER}

To those of us who are perfectionists and who abhor the trials and tribulations of over-the board play, there is available a neat escape from the cruel, hard world of tournament chess. This haven is known as correspondence play. Here we may ponder to our hearts' content, to the beat of a clock that ticks in days instead of seconds. We may have access to opening books, end-game books, middle game books (of little value), and advice from better players. It is just as if we are playing a tournament game which is adjourned after each move. Secure in the solitude of one's study, one can work out the correct strategies and avoid the ever-present tactical pitfalls. And, of course, losses can always be attributed to having written down the wrong move.

Even though the above was presented somewhat with tongue in cheek, there is much truth in it. I am sure that it is no exaggeration to say that a postal player can perform at least one-and more probably two - categories above his over-the-board skill. That is to say, any player of master strength should be able to play as well in correspondence chess as a grandmaster does over the board. Since this is very close to perfection, it is a matter of conjecture just how much closer to perfection a grandmaster would come in correspondence play. Actually, few grandmasters play in international correspondence tournaments. The ones that do, have had varying results. Ragozin won the 2nd Correspondence World Championship, being the only grandmaster in the field. O'Kelly was again the only grandmaster in winning the 3rd Championship, but missed the win of a clear piece in one game. In the current 4th Championship Finals, Tolush is the only grandmaster, having made a perfect score in the semifinals. But he is having his troubles in the finals and has lost two games thus far.
Closer to home, only one of America's grandmasters has recently competed in correspondence play. He achieved nothing of note in a "Chess Review" tournament. Obviously individual temperament
plays a role in all this. Not everyone, no matter how good an over-the-board player, is willing to apply himself at all times to the painstaking analysis required to bring out that ultra-nth of refinement needed to produce correspondence perfection. But it is achievablethough certainly not every position can yield to even the most extensive analysis. For instance: What is the best first move? The solution to this question will take the whole chess community many decades.

However it is posible to play very ac curate correspondence chess in most sit uations. In this and the following articles in this series, I shall attempt to present to my readers an idea of what can be achieved. The examples will be mostly from my own games, but some samples from world championship events will also be presented.

Witness the following position which occurred in the semi-finals of the 5th Correspondence World Championship, now in its concluding stages.
L. R. REITSTEIN - S. AFRICA

H. BERLINER - U.S.A.
34. N-K5!

Gaining a tempo in the race to dominate the center, as Black cannot afford to the exchange of Knights. E.g., 34 ........, NxN; 35. PxN, K-Q2; 36. K-N4!! (threatening K-R5 which puts Black in Zugzwang), P-N3; 37. P-QR4, K-B1; 38. K-B4, K-B2; 39. P-N3, K-N2; 40. P-R5!!, K-B2 (not ........, PxP; 41. K-B5, K-B2; 42. P-R3, ........, and wins); 41. PxPch, KxP; 42. P-QN4, P-R4; 43. P-R3!, K-B2!; 44. K-B5, P-R5; 45. PxP, K-Q2; 46. P-R5, K-K2; 47. P-R6, K-B2; 48. KxP, P-B5; 49. P-N5, P-B6; 50. P-N6, P-B7; 51. P-

Senior Master Hans Berliner, after experimenting with postal chess as a youngster, resumed playing that form of chess seriously in 1955. Since then he has thrice swept to clean scores in Chess Review's Golden Knights tournaments in three attempts. He is currently competing in the semi-finals of the World Correspondence Championships. Over-the-board Hans has won the Eastern Open Championship, the N.Y. State Championship, the District of Columbia title several times, the Southern Championship, the Southwest Open, the Mid-Continent Open, the Colorado Championship, and the Champion of Champions toumey. In National competition his best showing in the U.S. Championship was fifth place in 1957. In 1959 he tied for fourth in the U.S. Open. In this series of articles, the reader will be introduced to the world of master correspondence chess.

N7, P-B8 (Q); 52. P-N8 (Q)-with winning endgame. There are other lines but the winning ideas are the same and only the order of moves is different.

\section*{34.}
\(\qquad\) N-N3
If 34. ........, N-B3; 35. K-Q4, N-K5; 36. P-QN4, P-R4; 37. P-N3!, K-Q3; 38. N-B4 ch, K-Q2; 39. P-QR4! and Black will soon be in a zugswang.
35. K-Q4
N-Q4
36. P-N3
K-Q3

Black has pinned his hopes on this move since, if White wins the KRP, his knight will become trapped-but it is not that easy.
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 37. N-B7ch } & \text { K-K2 } \\
\text { 38. } \mathrm{NxP!}!\text { K-B3! }
\end{array}
\]

In order to keep the K out of K5. 39. K-B5!!

The point of the whole maneuver. It was only after I discovered the idea of blockading the \(Q\)-side with the king and pawn at QR5 that I seriously considered the Knight sacrifice. All of Black's pieces will be tied down by the strong K \& P position. Instead, the idea of 39. N-N8 ch, K-B2; 40. K-K5, KxN; 41. KxP leads nowhere as Black has too much counterplay with his Knight.

39.

K-N2?
The losing move. Black has to tread a very fine line to draw and here he loses his way with a very natural move. Correct is 39 . ........, K-N3; since 40 . NxP,


KxN!; leaves Black in possession of a potentially passed KP after NxBP and this threat draws easily. Instead, White can try one of two variations which require play of the highest order by Black in order to draw:
A) 39. ........, K-N3; 40. P-QR4, KxN; 41. P-R5, K-R4!!; (forcing White to waste a tempo with the KRP, the point of this will appear later.) 42. P-R3, K-N3; 43. K-Q6, K-B2!!!; 44. P-R4, K-B3. If it were not for Black's 41st move, White could reach this position with Black to play and it would now continue: 45 . K-B2; 46. P-R5, K-B3; 47. K-Q7!!, P-B4; 48. K-B8!, P-N4; 49. P-QR6, P-B5; 50. K-N7, P-B6; 51. P-R7, P-B7; 52. P-R8(Q), P-B8(Q); 53. Q-B8 mate! Now this idea is not possible and without the White \(P\) at KR5 White must be satisfied with perpetual check.
B) The line I intended to play after 39. K-N3; 40. N-N8!, K-B2!; 41. PQR4, P-N3 ch !!!!; (but not KxN ??; 42. P-R5 !, K-B2; 43. K-Q6 which leads to the winning position of variation "A".) 42. KxP, KxN; 43. K-Q6, K-B2 and Black can hold the game. e.g. 44. P-R4, N-B6; 45. K-B6, N-Q4 etc.
\begin{tabular}{lr} 
40. NxPch & PxN \\
41. P-QR4 & K-B2 \\
42. K-Q6 & N-B6
\end{tabular}

An attempted swindle. If now 43. KB7?, NxP! draws.

\section*{43. P-R5! N-N4ch}

Nor is N-Q4 satisfactory, e.g. 44. P-R4, K-B3; 45. K-Q7, P-B4; 46. K-Q6!!, P-B5; 47. PxP, N-K6; 48. K-B5 and White, with three pawns for the piece, wins easily.
44. K-B5

K-K3
45. P-R4
N-Q3
46. K-N6 K-Q2
47. P-R5 Resigns

The main variation is: 47. ........, K-B1; 48. P-KR6, N-B2; 49. P-R7, N-R1 (unfortunately for Black, a tempo must be lost) 50. P-R6, PxP; 51. KxBP, K-Q1; 52. K-N6, K-K2; 53. KxP, K-B3; 54. PQN4, K-N2; 55. P-N5, N-B2; 56. P-N6, N-Q1; 57. P-N7, N-B3; 58. K-N6, N-N1; 59. K-B7, N-R3 ch; 60, K-B8, KxP; 61. P-N8(Q), NxQ; 62. KxN, K-R3; 63. KB7, K-R4; 64. K-Q6, K-N5; 65. K-K5 and wins.

The conception that White executed in this endgame, that of sacrificing a knight for a pawn and position, is certainly a rare one. It was quite difficult to discover as there were many other lines by which White could have retained his advantage without having really good winning chances. The position resembles a composed study, making it extremely unlikely that anyone could discover the best line over the board.

\section*{THE EASTERN OPEN}

July 2-3-4-5, 1964
Playing Site:
Marriott Motor Hotel
Twin Bridges, U.S. \#1 Washington, D.C.
with outstanding facilities and accommodations.
Prizes:

\section*{Minimum \(\$ 900\) prize fund: guaranteed}

\section*{1st prize \(\$ 400\); 2nd, \(\$ 250\);} 3rd, \$150.
Added prizes awarded according to size of entry. Prizes \& trophies to Top Experts, Juniors, Women, as well as Unrated, A, B, and C.
Entry Fee:
\$12 for Adults; \(\$ 7\) for juniors (under 18). Send advance entries and inquiries to:

> EV RAFFEL
> 10103 Leder Rd. SILVER SPRING, MD.

Players are requested to bring clocks.
Previous Winners:
1960-James Sherwin
1961-Eliot Hearst
1962-Pal Benko
1963-Arthur Feuerstein


\section*{WINDSOR CASTLE}

\section*{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.
\(\mathbf{\$ 2 0 . 0 0}\) less \(\mathbf{1 5 \%}\) to USCF members............................................ \(\mathbf{\$ 1 6 . 9 5}\)
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.
.\$19.75

\section*{LESSONS IN THE ENDGAME-No. XI}

\section*{by DR. ERICH W. MARCHAND}

\section*{1. Bishops of Opposite Colors}

Endings where each side is left with one Bishop (aside from Pawns) with these Bishops moving on opposite colored squares are notorious for being drawish. This is sometimes true even when one side is a Pawn or more behind. There are, however, a number of exceptional cases, and the sample game given below is one of these.

One of the features which changes the usual pattern in the present example is Black's superior King position in accordance with the rule that in most endings the King must play an active part. The role of passed Pawns likewise proves to be crucial.

\section*{2. Illustrative Game SICILIAN DEFENSE} Rochester City Championship, 1964
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{White: J. Poluikis} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Black: D. Reithel} \\
\hline 1. P-K4 & P.QB4 & 16. R-B1 & \\
\hline 2. P-KB4 & N-QB3 & 17. Q-Q2 & B-QN5 \\
\hline 3. N-KB3 & P.K3 & 18. B-B3 & B-B3 \\
\hline 4. B-K2 & N-B3 & 19. KR-K1 & N-K5 \\
\hline 5. P-Q3 & B-K2 & 20. BxN & PxB \\
\hline 6. P-QN3 & P.Q4 & 21. P-QR3 & BxN \\
\hline 7. PXP & PxP & 22. RxB & B-Q4 \\
\hline 8. P.Q4 & 0.0 & 23. P-QN4 & Q-K3 \\
\hline 9. \(\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}\) & PxP & 24. Q-K3 & B-B5 \\
\hline 10. NxP & B-QB4 & 25. Q-N3 & B-Q4 \\
\hline 11. P-B3 & Q-N3 & 26. Q-K3 & QR-B1 \\
\hline 12. B-N2 & R-K1 & 27. R(1)-QB & RxR \\
\hline 13. K-RI & \(\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}\) & 28. RxR & R-QB1 \\
\hline 14. PxN & B.Q3 & 29. P-KR3 & RxR \\
\hline 15. N-B3 & B.Q2 & 30. BxR & P.84 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


Position after 30. P-B4
In the diagram position Black must be considered as having the advantage becouse of (1) his protected passed Pawn (2) the fact that White's passed Pawn is isolated and (3) the open lines Black has for pentrating White's territory. However, the presence of Bishops of opposite colors makes it unclear whether Black's advantage is sufficient to win. 31. B-K1 Q-QB3
32. Q-QB3 K-B2!

As soon as the Queens are exchanged, the quick entry of Black's King will prove highly important.

\section*{33. \(Q \times Q\)}

It would appear that 33 . K.N1 would be better. To be sure White would like to avoid exchanging Queens if he could do so without letting the black Queen into his backyard. On 33. Q-B5, P-QN3 White must exchange Queens.

\section*{33. ........ BxQ 34. P-Q5!}

A curious sacrifice based actually on desperation in view of 34 . K-N1, K-K3; 35. K-B2, K-Q4; 36. K-K3, K-B5; 37. B-Q2, K-N6; 38. B-B1; K-B7; 39. B-Q2, K-N7. Giving up the QP gives White's King and Bishop more mobility and an avenue of attack on Black's Pawns. Also, White will be able to solidify his \(Q\)-side Pawns. 34.

> BxP
36. P-R5 P-K61
35. P-QR4 B-B3

As usual with Bishops of opposite color one side has trouble controlling the white squares and the other side the black squares. Here the KP restricts the mobility of White's Bishop and King on the black squares while Black's Bishop will control the white squares. Incidentally, by placing this Pawn on a black square, the mobility of Black's Bishop is increased!

\section*{37. K-NI \\ K-K3 \\ 38. B-B3}

Note that 38. K-B1, B-N4ch illustrates the combined power of Black's Bishop and KP.


Position after 38. B-B3,
On the routine 38. ........, P-KN3, comes 39. B-Q4, P-K7; 40. B-B3 (not 40. K-B2, \(\mathrm{BxP})\), K-Q4; 41. K-B2 and Black will never be able to win. Hence Black plays 38. ....... K-Q4! 40. B-B8 K-Q6 39. BxP K-B5 41. P-N5! ........

Again based on desperation because of 41. K-B1, K-Q7; 42. B-K7, P-K7ch or 41. B-K7, K-Q7; 42. B-R4, P-K7.
41. ........

Px \(\mathbf{P}\)
Much better than 41. ........., BxP since now Black has a second passed Pawn. 42. P.N4

White's only hope is to create a passed Pawn of his own. He has time for this now because of his Pawn sacrifice. For instance \(42 . . . . . . . ., ~ K-Q 7 ; ~ 43 . ~ B-N 4 c h, ~ K-Q 8 ; ~ ;\) 44. K-B1, P-K7ch; 45. K-B2
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 42. ... & PxP & 44. P-N5 & K-K5 \\
\hline 43. PxP & B-B6 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

More direct would be 44. ........, K-B5 so as to push the NP quickly. White's
passed Pawn can easily be stopped by the Bishop.

\section*{\(\begin{array}{llll}\text { 45. B.Q6 K-Q4 } & \text { 46. B-R3 } & \text { B-N5 }\end{array}\)}

Now there is no point in an immediate K-B5. For instance, 46. ........, K-B5; 47. B-B1! (47. P-B5, P-N5; 48. P-B6, B-R4; 49. B-B1, K-K6), K-Q6; 48. B-R3! 47. \(\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{BI} \quad \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{BS} \quad\) 48. B-B1


Position after 48. K-B1, 48.

P-N5!
Sacrificing the KP is the winning idea. But more precise is 48. ........, K-Q6; 49. B-R3, K-B6!; 50. B-B1, P-N5 gaining one tempo as compared to the game. Dubious is 48 . \(\qquad\) P-K7ch; 49. K-K1, P-N5; 50. P-B5, BxP; 51. KxP, K-B6; 52. B-Q2ch, K-N6; 53. K-Q1, K-R6; 54. K-B1 drawing even though Black can win the RP.

Black cannot gain a tempo as compared to the game line. For instance 49. ........, K-Q6; 50. K-B2!
50. B-B1 K-B6 52. BxPch KxB 51. K-B2 P-N7 53. K-K3

Hopeless is 53. K-N3, B-B4.
53. ........ K.B6
55. P-B5
B-R4
54. K-K4 K-N5

A trap is 55. ........, KxP; 56. K-K5 (56. P-N6, PxP; 57. PxP, B-K3), P-N4?; 57. P-N61, PxP; 58. P-B6 forcing a Queen. However, 56. ......... BxP! would still win as in the game.
56. K-K5 KxP 57. K-B6

Too slow is 57. P-B6, P-N4; 58. K-K6, P-N5; 59. P-B7, BxPch.
\begin{tabular}{llll} 
57. & 5..... & PN4 & 59. \\
58. \(\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 7\) & \(\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 5\) & 60. P-N6 & P-N6 \\
& &
\end{tabular}


\section*{Position after 60. P-N6, \\ 60. \\ BxPch}

An interesting alternative is 60 . P-N7; 61. P-N7 (61. P-B6, P-N8 (Q)), B-B2; 62. P-N8 (Q), BxQch; 63. KxB, P-N8 (Q); 64. P-B6, Q-N3ch (if the White \(P\) were already on B7, this would only yield a draw because of 65 . K-R1, QxP stalemate).

\section*{61. KxB}

No better is 61. PxB, P-N7; 62. P-N7,

P－N8ch leading to a well－known winning position due to the fact that White＇s Pawn is NP．With a BP or RP on the seventh rank the game would be drawn．
61.

P－N7
63．K－N7
Q－N7
62．P－B6

\section*{P－N8（Q）ch}

Here again White could draw if his Pawn were on the seventh instead of the sixth rank．


Position after 63. Q－N7 64．K－B7
Or 64．K－N6，Q－N5；65．K－N7（65．P－B7， Q－B1 or 65 ．K－B7，K－N3），Q－Q5 ete．
64.
K－N3
66．Resigns

65．K－K7 Q－K4ch
Perhaps White had hoped for 65 \(\qquad\) K－B2；66．K－K8，QxP？stalemate！

The endgame presented some difficult problems．The play by both sides，though not perfect，was commendable．

\section*{HEARST－}
（Continued from page 93）
it into that phase which absolutely defies an evaluation by visual means， and one is forced to follow a＂move－ by－move＂system，or even＂variation－by－ variation＂．

It came about that one of these had to pit his strength and the＂vital capacity＂of his style in a personal combat against the greatest chess player of the past twenty years－Mikhail M． Botvinnik．The result of this duel，as well as the tournaments prior to it， prove，firstly，that in the person of Mikhail Tal，we have a representative of a definite trend，and secondly，that the existence of this trend does not mean the end of the struggle based both on the figuring of variations and on logic and principles．

The author of this book has played， in the course of his twenty years of chess life，not a few sharp games，full of tension，which at times could be balanced on the edge of a knife，but it would be vexing to reach the con－ clusion that the basis of chess is a pure ＂counting of variations＂．And I hope that the coming history of chess will not bring this about，and that the new style will become one of the elements in the arsenal of creative and technical weapons of the art of chess．

Send all material for this column to Eliot Hearst， 401 N．Armistead St．，Alexandria 12，Va．

\section*{Chart of QUEEN＇S GAMBIT}

\author{
Now Ready \\ At New Reduced Price \\ — Only \＄2－
}

Covers opening moves of more than 5300 tournament games by the world＇s greatest players．Gives actual percentage of wins for every single move． 40 informa－ tion－packed pages．

Charts Now Available－
1．Sicilian
2．Ruy Lopez
3．Nimzo－Indian
4．King＇s Indian
5．French
6．Caro－Kann
7．Queen＇s Gambit
All charts now only \(\$ 2\) each，or all seven for \(\$ 13\) ，postpaid．Satis－ faction guaranteed，or your money refunded．

\section*{Order from}

CHESS CHARTS
3533 Central Avenue， San Diego，Calif． 92105

\section*{AMATEURS TO COMPETE IN ASBURY PARK}

\section*{The Tournament：}

\section*{The United States Amateur Chess Championship}

\section*{The Dates：}

May 28－29－30－31， 1964

\section*{The Place：}

The Empress Motel，opposite the board－ walk in Asbury Park，New Jersey

\section*{The Schedule：}


Open to all who are or become USCF members except Rated Masters．

The winner will be recognized as the U．S．Amateur Champion and will retain custody of the MAX PAVEY MEMORIAL TROPHY for one year．

\section*{Entry fee： \(\mathbf{\$ 1 0 . 0 0}\)}

Send advance entries to
USCF
80 E．11th St．
New York 3，N．Y．

\title{
U．S．AMATEUR CHAMPIONS
}

Men＇s Champion
\begin{tabular}{ll}
1942 & E．S．Jackson，Jr． \\
1943 & Dr．Ariel Mengarini \\
1944 & E．S．Jackson，Jr． \\
1945 & Paul Ellis \\
\(1946-1954\) No tournament \\
1955 & Clinton L．Parmelee \\
1956 & John A．Hudson \\
1957 & Harry Lyman \\
1958 & Dr．Erich W．Marchand \\
1959 & Russell Chauvenet \\
1960 & Raoul L．Benedicto \\
1961 & Edgar T．McCormick \\
1962 & Dr．Max Cohen \\
& Ben Greenwald（tie） \\
1963 & Kenneth Clayton
\end{tabular}

Women＇s Champion
ニーーーー
ーーーーー
ニニーー
Kathryn Slater
Kathryn Slater
Rosalie De Serrano
Greta Fuchs
Lisa Lane
Greta Fuchs
Greta Fuchs
Adele Goddard
Cecelia Rock

\section*{The Latest on the Marshall Gambit}

Marshall's famous gambit against the Ruy Lopez has attracted generations of chessplayers wishing to meet 1. P-K4 by 1. ........, P-K4 while escaping the 'Lopez grip.' After a period in the doldrums, the Marshall has swung right back into fashion during the last year. The present article summarises the latest position up to the 1964 Soviet zonal in Moscow.

The gambit is reached by 1. P-K4, P-K4; 2. N-KB3, N-QB3; 3. B-N5, P-QR3; 4. B-R4, N-B3; 5. O-O, B-K2; 6. R-K1, P-QN4; 7. B-N3, O-O; 8. P-B3.

In my book The Ruy Lopez, I give 8. P-QR4 as the practical player's antidote to the Marshall. It stops the pawn sacrifice and leads to a positional type of game in which White has the advantage against any but precise play by his opponent. For a full analysis, readers are referred to The Ruy Lopez, pp. 54-65.


The starting point of the gambit proper 9. ......... P-K5 has dropped from fashion, though recent analysis suggests that White has only one clear way to a plus: 10. \(\mathrm{PxN}, \mathrm{PxN}\); and now there are two lines: (a) 11. P-Q4! (b) 11. QxP(?) (a) 11. P.Q4!, PxP; 12. Q-B3! In my book, I also recommended 12. B-KN5, but this is less favourable because of 12 . B-KN5; 13. Q-Q3, R-K1; 14. N-Q2, N-R4; 15. BxB (15. RxB, RxR; 16. P-KR3 is refuted by 16. ........, B-K3! and Black has good play because of his control of KB5), RxB; 16. RxR, QxR; 17. Q-K3, R-K1; 18. R-K1, K-B1; 19. QxQch, RxQ; 20. RxR, KxR with good endgame drawing chances, according to Chess Archives.

With 12. Q-B3, White preserves the option of developing his QB at KN5 or KB4. 12. \(\qquad\) , R-K1 (if 12. \(\qquad\) ., N-N5; 13. B-KB4); 13. B-N5, P-QR4; 14. P-QR3, B-KN5; 15. QxP, B-KB4; 16. N-Q2 and White has both an extra pawn and the initiative (Vasyukov-Tolush, Moscow 1961).
(b) 11. QxP, B-KN5; 12. Q-N3, B-Q3 (12. ........, R-K1; 13. P-B3!, B-Q3; 14. Q-B2, RxRch; 15. QxR, Q-K1; 16. Q-B2! doesn't give Black enough attack); 13. P-KB4, R-K1; 14. P-Q4, N-R4; 15. RxRch, QxR; 16. Q-B2, QxP; 17. P-KR3, B-K3!; 18. B-K3,

R-K1; 19. N-Q2, BxB; 20. PxB, P-N4!; 21. N-B1, PxP!; 22. B-Q2, N-N6 is an equalizing line, according to the Archives.

\section*{10. \(\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}\) \\ 11. RxN \\ \(\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}\)
\(\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 3\)}

Marshall's original idea for conducting the attack, 11. ........, N-KB3, has gone out of favor. White's correct plan is 12. P-Q4, B-Q3; 13. R-K2!


If now (a) 13. ........, N-R4; 14. Q-Q3, QB3 (a Soviet suggestion).
(b) 13. ........, N-R4; 14. Q.Q3, Q-R5; 15. P-N3, Q-R6; 16. B-Q5!, B-KB4; 17. Q-K3, QR-Q1; 18. B-N2 (Tal-Witkovsky, Riga 1959). Black has nothing for his pawn.
(c) 13 .

N-N5? ; 14. P-KR3, Q-R5;

\section*{A CHESS LIFE Exclusive by LEONARD BARDEN}
15. N-Q2, B-N2; 16. N-B1. Black's attack is repulsed.
\begin{tabular}{lr} 
12. P-Q4 & B-Q3 \\
13. R-K1 & Q-R5 \\
14. P-N3 & Q-R6 \\
15. B-K3 & B-KN5 \\
16. Q-Q3 & \(-\ldots .\).
\end{tabular}


A key position, in which Black can choose between the pawn attack 16. ...., P-KB4 and the piece build-up with 16. ........, QR-K1. A third alternative, 16. ........, P-N4, against which Euwe claims only a White initiative, is rather easily refuted by 17. BxP, P-KB4; 18. B-KR4! followed by 19 . Q-B1, forcing the exchange of queens.

In recent months, 16. \(\qquad\) QR-K1 has
got the upper hand. After 16. ........, KB4, play is complicated, but ought to favor White:
(a) 16. ........, P-KB4; 17 .P-KB4, QR-K1; 18. N-Q2, K-R1; 19. BxN, PxB; 20. Q-B1, Q-R4; 21. P-QR4, P-KN4; 22. RPxP, RPxP (22. \(\qquad\) P-QR4!?; 23. PxP, RxB; 24. RxR, P-B5; 25. R-B3!, BxR; 26. QxR, QxP; 27. P-KN4, R-K1; 28. N-B1 is insufficientArchives) 23. PxP, RxB; 24. RxR, P-B5; 25. PxP, BxP; 26. R-N3, QxP; 27. K-R1.


This occurred in Boleslavsky-Tal, Soviet club championship 1962. The position is favourable to White, writes Boleslavsky: he gives 27. R-KN1; 28. N-B3; Q-B4; 29. N-K5! (the actual game went 29. RxB?), BxR; 30. PxB, B-B6ch; 31. NxB, RxP; 32. N-R4!, QxQch; 33. RxQ, R-R6ch; 34. K-N2, RxN; 35. R-B5 with a winning rook ending.

Archives suggests 27. B-Q3 as an improvement; giving 28. Q-N2, BxR; 29. QxB, P-KR4. However, White should still win with 30. R-KB1, since after 30. RxRch (30. ........ R-K1; 31. Q-B4); 31. NxR, P-R5; 32. Q-K5ch, QxQ; 33. PxQ, K-N1; 34. N-K3, B-B6ch; 35. K-N1, K-B2; 36. N-N2, Black's ending is lost.
(b) 16 . P-KB4; 17. P-KB4, P-KN4; 18. Q-B1, Q-R4; 19. N-Q2, QR-K1; 20. Q-N2 (also good enough is 20 . BxNch, PxB; 21. Q-N2, R-K5!; 22. PxP!, K-R1!; 23. P-KR4!, P-B5; 24. NxR, PxN; 25. BxP, BxB; 26. \(\mathrm{PxB}, \mathrm{RxP}\); 27. RxP!, B-B6; 28. RxR, BxQ; 29. KxB, Q-K7ch; 30. R-B2, Q-N5ch; 31. \(\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{QxRP} ; 32\). R-K1. This is analysis by Unzicker: there are side variations, but I don't want to confuse readers with any more detail than is necessary) 20 . PxP; 21. BxNch!.


Black's position is lost now, e.g.:
(b1): 21. ........, PxB; 22. QxPch, K-N2 (22. ........, K-R1; 23. QxB, PxB; 24. RxP!); 23. BxP, BxB; 24. PxB, B-K7; 25. Q-N2ch! (Archives gives 25. N-B1, but then 25. ........, R-K5! is good for Black), K-R1; 26.

Q-KB2!, Q-N3ch; 27. K-R1, Q-B3ch; 28. Q-N2, Q-K3; 29. N-B1 and White's material advantage can now take over (Unzick-er-Pfleger, match 1963).
(b2) 21 . \(\qquad\) K-R1; 22. BxKBP, BxB; 23. BxP, B-K6ch; 24. K-R1, B-R6 (if 24. ........ R-K3; Bobby Fischer's move 25. \(\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 3\) ! forces a winning ending); 25. Q-K2, B-N5; 26. BxR!, RxB; 27. QxKB and White wins (Boleslavsky).


The Russians seem convinced that this position represents best play in the Marshall both for White and Black. When it occurred in Novopashin-Spassky in the 1963 Soviet championship, Novopashin's clock to here showed three minutes and Spassky's 50 seconds.

\section*{18. P-QR4}

The Archives and Euwe in his article in Chess Review recommend 18. BxN, PxB; 19. P-QR4 here, but Black can still play 19. \(\qquad\) PxP! with similar play to the main line. Other plans are inferior, e.g. 19. ........, P-B4; 20. Q-B1, Q-R4; 21. P-KB4, KR-K1; 22. B-B2!, R-K7; 23. Q-N2!, Q-B2; 24. PxP, PxP; 25. N-B1 and White consolidates the pawn (Boleslavsky).
18. Q-B1, Q-R4; 19. P-QR4 is another way. Black continues 19. ........, P-KB4; 20. P-KB4, PxP!; 21. RxP (not 21. BxN, PxB; 22. QxP, R-R3 followed by \(\qquad\) BxP and

\section*{The World Chess Championship, 1963}

\author{
Botvinnik v. Petrosian
}

Edited and Commented on by R. G. Wade

All the games of the match, fully annotated, with photos, background material, biographical information, etc.

> List Price . . . \$4.50

Price to USCF Members:
\(\$ 3.95\)
wins), KR-K1; 22. RxP, RxB; 23. RxR, RxR; 24. RxP, Q-K1; 25. BxNch, K-B1; 26. N-K4! (not 26. RxB?, R-K8).


This position (after 26. N-K4) occurred in a game still in progress between Dragunov and Konstantinopolsky in the Soviet postal championship. 'Unclear' is Konstantinopolsky's verdict: but how does Black demonstrate compensation for the pawns? It could be that this line will prove the Achilles heel of the Marshall.

In Suetin-Geller from the 1963 Soviet championschip, Black played 18. Q-B1, Q-R4; 19. P-QR4, PxP; 20. RxP, P-KB4. Here White could transpose to the Drag-unov-Konstantinopolsky game by 21. PKB4, but chose a possibly still stronger line: 21. P-QB4, P-B5; 22. PxN, RxB.... 23. PxR, PxNP; 24. PxPch, K-R1; 25. PxP, RxQch; 26. RxR, Q-KN4; 27. R-KB4! and White's QBP became very powerful.

\section*{18.}

\section*{PxP!}

This capture, rather than leaving Black's QNP at QN4, represents the latest finesse in the Marshall.

\section*{19. \(\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}\)}

If \(19 . \mathrm{BxP}\), the best for both sides is 19. ......... KR-K1; 20. BxP, RxB; 21. RxR, RxR; 22. PxR, BxP; 23. PxB, QxPch; 24. K-R1 with perpetual check.
19.

P-KB4

20. Q-B1!

In Novopashin-Spassky, White fell into the sucker punch 20. P-KB4??, BxP!; 21. B-B2 (21. PxB, R-N3), RxRch; 22. BxR, R-K1; 23. Resigns (23. B-B2, BxN; 24. QxB, B-B6).
\begin{tabular}{lr} 
20. \(\ldots \ldots \ldots\) & P-B5 \\
21. \(\mathbf{Q x Q}\) & BxQ \\
22. \(R x P!\) & \(\ldots \ldots .\).
\end{tabular}

This innovation was prepared by Soviet champion Leonid Stein for the 1964 Soviet Zonal. Anything else loses, but this doesn't win.


Not 23. NxR; 24. PxN, R-B1; 25. N-K4, and White comes out with three strong pawns for a bishop.

\section*{24. PxR \\ B-K2!}

Either 24. ........, R-B1?; 25. RxP! or 24. ........, B-K3; 25. RxP, R-Q1; 26. N-K4 would lose.
25. RxP
26. BxN
E-N4!
26. BxNch
K-R1


Black finds a cute solution to his difficulties. Even in this bare position, the Marshall theme of king's side attack carries a powerful punch. If White saves the piece by \(26 . \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{BxP} \mathrm{ch} ; 27\). K-R1, R-QR1! and Black wins.

\section*{27. B-N2 BxP ch}

Now the game winds up in peaceful equality. Stein-Spassky, Soviet zonal 1964, concluded 28. K-R1, BxB ch; 29. KxB BxN; 30. P-QN4, P-N4; 31. P-N4, B-K8; 32. P-Q5, draw agreed. There is still some play left, though the three pawns balance the bishop, e.g. 32...... R-Q1; 33. R-B5 (33. P-Q6, B-Q7 and ...... B-B5), K-N2; 34. P-N5, R-Q3; 35. P-B4, K-B3; 36. R-B6, K-K4.

One thing is clear: the Marshall is still eluding all the nets cast by whiteside theoreticians. The great Frank Marshall would have been proud to know that, twenty years after his death, his brain-child sets problems that have so far remained unsolved by the finest players of the modern generation.

\footnotetext{
Howard, K. S. THE
ENJOYMENT OF CHESS PROBLEMS
A classic treatise on the fundamentals of problem composition, together with 200 time-tested problems. 3rd revised edition. Index. 220 pp .

Paperbound \(\$ 1.25\)
Howard, Kenneth S.
HOW TO SOLVE CHESS PROBLEMS
58 two-movers, 46 three-movers, and 8 fourmovers by 27 of America's foremost problemists, 112 problems. Index. 177 pp.

Paperbound \(\$ \mathbf{1 . 0 0}\)
Mansfield and Harley 101 CHESS PUZ. ZLES-AND HOW TO SOLVE THEM The problems are the work of Comins Mansfield, one of the most distinguished men in the field of chess composition; the introduction and explanations are by Brian Harley, an outstanding authority on problems. 101 diagrams. 124 pp .

List Price \(\$ 2.50\) Members \(\$ 2.25\)

\section*{USCF}

80 E. 11th St.
New York 3, N.Y.
}

\section*{Here and There}

Robert Gauntt won the championship of the Washington (D.C.) Chess Divan with a score of \(71 / 2-21 / 2\). U. S. Amateur Champion Kenneth Clayton led the \(7-3\) contingent to take second. Unfortunately, last year's champion, Jack Mayer, did not defend his title and such Divan stalwarts as Hearst, Berliner, Avram and Gilden were also missing from the 20 player field.

Still in our Nation's capital: Bobby Fischer took on 65 boards in front of more than 100 spectators on Sunday, March 8 at The Roosevelt and was forced to resign to Mark Smith, Lou Hucks, Daniel Matthews and Henry Steinbach in addition to being held to ten draws. Not one of Fischer's best days, but 51 chess victories in a single session isn't too bad, either! (For some of us, it's about a year's quota).

The Canadian Open will be played just prior to our own U. S. Open. It will be held from August 1 through August 9 at Scarborough, Ontario (a suburb cast of Toronto) and more than \(\$ 1,000\) in prizes will be awarded. U. S. players interested in further details should contact Mr. Howard Ridout, 77 Beachview Cres., Toronto 13, Ontario, Canada.

Two more USCF International Tournaments: The Langman International, played at Clarkson College, Potsdam, N.Y. attracted 16 players and was won by Joseph G. Rosenstein, Ithaca, N.Y. with \(41 / 2-1 / 2\). Runner-up was Erich W. Marchand, Rochester, N.Y., 4-1.

A Rating Improvement Tournament in Denver, Colorado drew 12 entries and was won by Richard Moran with a straight 5-0. Wesley Koehler, 4-1, was second.

A tournament played at the East Lansing (Mich.) Chess Club saw Edgar Sneiders win the Experts Section, Joab Blech score in Class A, and Robert Crafton take top honors in Class B.

The annual North Carolina Invitational Tournament was won by David Steele of Raleigh, N.C. with a perfect 5-0. Run-ner-up in the round robin event, played in Raleigh on March 20-22, was Jerry Fink of Durham, 4-1.

Jose Soto, newly-arrived from Costa Rica, swept to a \(5-0\) victory in the Huntsville (Ala.) City Championship in January. C. R. Wallace, 4-1, took second and Larry Kiefling, \(31 / 2-11 / 2\), was third.

The Berkshire Hills Amateur, played in Pittsfield, Mass. on March 15 and 22, was won by Carl McClure with a
score of 5-1. John Ducharme Sr. edged out Eli Bourdon for second, both scoring \(41 / 2\). Nineteen players competed with Robert Bilodeau acting as T.D.
R. S. Vandenburg of Boise successfully defended his title of Idaho State Champion at Twin Falls on February 15-16. Vandenburg scored 4-1 to finish half a point ahead of Ted Hartwell of Twin Falls in the 8-player competition.

The Westside Conference Championship, sponsored by the Westchester Chess Club (Calif.), drew 16 entries and was won by Bill Maillard with an unequalled score of 5-1 (two draws). John Huffman ( \(41 / 2\) ) was runner-up.

The San Jacinto Open, played at Texas A \& M University, was won by Robert Brieger of Houston who edged out Eric Bone, Baytown, and Thomas Cunningham, Houston on tie-break points. All three players posted scores of 41 in the 28 -player tournament, directed by Capt. B. G. Dudley.

The University of Texas in Austin has recently compiled a considerable library on the history, theory, and practice of chess. The new collection, built over a period of years by Henry S. Dowsett, contains almost 1,000 books, periodicals and scrapbooks devoted to the game. The collection includes a complete set of The British Chess Magazine from 1881 to 1958 and tournament books of most of the great chess meets of the 20th Century.

A story in the Milwaukee "Journal" reveals that Arpad Elo, associate professor of physics at Marquette University and Chairman of the USCF's Rating Committee, has almost completed work on a new and highly sensitive spectroscope for use in detecting rare isotopes. The glass surface of the instrument has been polished to a smoothness that has eliminated all irregularities greater than one-millionth of an inch. Facts about the new instrument were related by Prof. Elo at a recent meeting of the Milwaukee Astronomical Society.

Mark Gilley edged out John Hurt on S-B points to take the Memphis (Tenn.) Chess Championship, concluded in early March. Both players scored \(71 / 2\) \(11 / 2\) in a ten-player round robin of the top ten USCF-rated players.

The seventh annual Arkansas State Championship, played in Little Rock on March 27-29, was won by Richard Long of Fort Smith, Ark. with a score of \(41 / 2-1 / 2\). Smith, a graduate student in economics
at Vanderbilt University, also won the tournament in 1961 and 1962. He was unable to compete in 1963 because of his studies. The '63 winner, Ron Taylor of Fort Smith, is now an exchange student in Germany and was unable to defend his title.

Second place in the 24 -player field went to David Coulter, Mablevale and third place was taken by Raymond Lawrence, Malvern-both with scores of 4-1.

Following the tournament, U.S. Champion Robert J. Fischer gave a lecture and played a thirty-six board simultaneous, winning every game.

Duncan Suttles of Reno, Nevada continues on his winning way; his latest tournament victory was in the South Central Valley Open in California on April \(3-5\), where he posted a perfect \(6-0\) to finish a big \(11 / 2\) points ahead of the 26 player field. Norman Miller of Fresno was second and Paul Smith took third. The tournament was sponsored cooperatively by the Fresno, Visalia and College of the Sequoias Chess Clubs and was directed by Dr. Theodore Bullockus.

The club championship of Chess Unlimited in Chicago was won by Harold Stanbridge with a big 12-0. Michael Smoron, \(10-2\), was second and William London was third with \(9-3\). The 13-player round robin ran from October through early February.

The 3rd Annual Tri-C Championship, sponsored by the Catholic Chess Club of New Orleans, was won by Henry Kleinfeldt with a score of \(121 / 2-1 / 2\). Second place in the 15 -player field went to Jules Le Bon III, with 12.

In Maryland, the 3rd Bay Region Rating Tournament, played in Dundalk, ended on March 28 with victory going to Lewis A. Hucks ( \(81 / 2 \cdot-1 / 2\) ). Duncan McKenzie (7-3) took second in a field of twelve players.

Saul Wachs swept to a 5-0 victory in the Central Ohio Open, played in Columbus. Joseph Terrible, 4-1, took second, in a 17-player field.

\section*{1964 U.S. OPEN \\ Sheraton plaza hotel Boston, Mass. \\ AUGUST 16-29}

\section*{HOUSING FOR JUNIORS}

Players who have not reached their 19th birthday by August 16th, 1964, and who wish to be housed in private homes should contact the Committee Member listed below no later than May 15, 1964:

FRANK FERDINAND 33 Manton Road
Swampscott, Mass. 01907

\section*{U.S. OPEN CHESS CHAMPIONSHIP - 1964}
"The Harry Nelson Pillsbury Memorial"
A 12 round Swiss international tournament open to any player in the world.

\section*{WHERE: The Sheraton-Plaza Hotel (Copley Square) Boston, Massachusetts}

\section*{WHEN: August 16-29, 1964}

PRIZES: \(\$ 1500\) for first place; others to be announced.

ENTRY FEE: \(\$ 20\) for U.S.C.F. members;
non-members must pay \(\$ 5.00\) for U.S.C.F. dues.
Sign up 10 of your friends for the U.S. Open (if you live outside of New England) and receive your entry fee free.

Send - checks or money orders payable to the
U.S. Chess Federation-to Entries Chairman, 981 Plymouth Street, Bridgewater, Mass.
E. M. Reubins-Honorary chairman
(Sharon Chess Club)
Harold Dondis-Co-chairman (Finance) (Johnson Chess Club)
Robert Goodspeed-Co-chairman (Arrangements) (Brockton Chess Club)

Eleanor Goodspeed-Secretary Harry Goober-Ticket Sales Chairman
Eleanor Terry-Entries chairman Frank Ferdinand-Housing chairman (Harvard Club Chess Club)
James Burgess-Public Relations Chm. (Boylston Chess Club)
(Claredon Chess Club)

Beverly Jarnigan-Activities Chairman
Joseph Hurvitz-Program Book Chairman
(Boylston Chess Club)

\section*{Plan NOW To Play in the Banner Chess Event of '64!}

\section*{100 SOVIET CHESS MINIATURES}

\author{
by P. H. CLARKE
}

In these games one is taken behind the scenes, as it were, in Soviet chess into that fiercest of arenas, the training-ground which has produced many of the outstanding grandmasters of the present day - Tal, Petrosian, Geller, Spassky and Korchnoi, to name a few. But the heroes are not the internationally famous; they are the ordinary masters, most of whom are hardly known outside the U.S.S.R.

Behind the brilliancies lie the lessons, learned the hard way by losers. It is the writer's belief that a study of errors committed and of the methods of gaining an advantage from them will be of use to the practical player, and these miniatures make light of the work involved. Here are both instruction and enjoyment at the same time.

List Price . . . \$4.50 USCF Members . . . \$3.85

\section*{USCF}

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


Tournament organizers wishing announcement of USCF rafed 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. 11th St., New York 3, N.Y.

\section*{May 2.3}

MINN. JR. CHAMPIONSHIP
5 -round Swiss, \(45 / 11 / 2\), restricted to Minn. residents under the age of 21 , will be played at the Duluth YMCA, 3rd Ave. W. \& 2nd St., Duluth, Minnesota. Registration: 8-9 A.M. Sat. \$2. entry fee plus USCF membership. Co-sponsored by the Minn. State Chess Assn. and the YMCA, the winner will receive the trophy and title of Minn. Jr. Champion. Other trophies to the highest ranking high school and junior high school students. A second but unrated tournament, the Duluth Amateur Open will be held simultaneously. For further info: Mr. G. Proechel, 629 E. 5th, Duluth, Minn. 55805.

\section*{May 2, 3}

\section*{NEW HAMPSHIRE OPEN}

5 -round Swiss, \(50 / 2\), will be played at the N.H. Savings Bank, Concord, N.H. Prizes: 1st, \(\$ 50 \mathrm{~min}\).; other cash prizes and trophies-starting time-9 A.M. Entry fee: regular \(\$ 6\); students, \(\$ 4\) plus USCF membership. For further details, write Mr. George Bart, 36 Dunklee St., Concord, New Hampshire.

May 8-10, 15-17
PHILADELPHIA CHAMPIONSHIP
Sponsored by the Phila. Chess Assn., a 6 -round Swiss, \(50 / 2^{1 / 2}\), will be played at the Central YMCA, 1421 Arch St., Phila., Pa. Restricted to Phila. residents
and members of the association's affiliated clubs, the title, \(\$ 75\). first prize and DiCamillo Trophy will go to the winner. Other prizes as income permits. Entry fee: \(\$ 7.50\); Juniors under 21, \(\$ 6\). Address inquiries to Mr. E. D. Strehle, 3480 Emerald St., Phila., Pa. 19134.

\section*{May 8-9}

\section*{6TH SAN BERNARDINO OPEN}

6 -round Swiss, \(30 / 1\) on the 1 st. and 3 rd. games, \(50 / 2\) on the 4,5 and 6 th. will be held at the San Bernardino Valley College, 701 Mt. Vernon Ave., San Bernardino, Calif. Entry: \(\$ 10.50\). 1st prize \(\$ 150\). and trophy; 2nd., \(\$ 75\). plus others. For further info: Stephen Skrypzak, 1553 Lassen St., Redlands, Calif.

\section*{May 15, 16, 17}

1964 ATLANTA OPEN
Sponsored by the Atlanta Chess Assn., a 6 -round Swiss, \(40 / 2\), will be played at the Atlantan Hotel, 111 Luckie St., Atlanta, Ga. Prizes: 1st \(\$ 300\); 2nd \(\$ 150\); 3rd \(\$ 100\); 4 th \(\$ 50\); classes \(\$ 25\) each; other awards. Entry fees: juniors under 18, \(\$ 6\); others rated under \(1850, \$ 8\); unrated \(\$ 9\); all others \(\$ 12\). Address advance entries and inquiries to tournament director, Dr. R. Froemke, Atlanta Chess Assn., Box 621, Atlanta, Ga. 30301.

Grandmaster Pal Benko will handle all adjudications and will conduct a simultaneous at the tourney site on Thursday (May 14, 7:30 P.M.). Special hotel rates and \(10 \%\) on advance entries until May 2.

\section*{May 15, 22; June 12, 19, 26}

JERSEY CITY SPRING TOURNAMENT
5 -round Swiss, \(50 / 2\), sponsored by the J. C. YMCA Chess Club will be held at the YMCA, 654 Bergen Ave., J.C. 4,

\title{
THE 3RD U.S. TEAM CHAMPIONSHIP JULY 10-11-12
}

\section*{Bethesda Youth Center 4506 Walsh Street Chery Chase 15, Md.}

\section*{\$600 in Cash Prizes; Winning Team \$150}

\begin{abstract}
6-Round Swiss system conducted on four boards for each team. Open to any team in the United States that is or becomes affiliated with USCF as an authorized chapter. Winning team is awarded title of U.S. Team Champion and receives permanent trophy for its possession and possession of team Championship trophy. For further details write to:
\end{abstract}

\section*{J. F. REINHARDT \\ 80 E. 11th St. \\ NEW YORK 3, N.Y.}
(And see the announcement in the May CHESS LIFE)
N.J. The entry fee of \(\$ 15.00\) ( \(\$ 9\). juniors under 18) includes a one year membership in the chess club, a \(\$ 10\). social membership in the YMCA and a \$2 forfeit fee which will be refunded upon completion of all games. Trophies will be awarded.

For further information contact the tournament director, Paul Helbig, 654 Bergen Ave., Jersey City 4, N.J.

\section*{May 16-17}

\section*{CENTRAL NEW YORK OPEN}

5 -round Swiss, registration 8 A.M., will be held in the Blue Room, Syracuse YMCA, 340 Montgomery St., Syracuse, N.Y. Entry fee: \(\$ 5\). Please bring USCF membership card, sets, boards and clocks. Trophy and title restricted. Cash prizes to the top scorers. Address inquiries to Mr. R. Sutliff, 2206 Midland Ave., Syracuse, N.Y. GR-8-2951.

\section*{May 16, 17}

\section*{INDIANA CHAMPIONSHIP}

5 -round Swiss, \(60 / 2\), will be held at Memorial Center, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana. Title restricted. Entry fees: \(\$ 5\) seniors; \(\$ 3\) juniors under 18. Awards: Trophies and book prizes. Registration until 9 A.M. May 16. For further information write, E. R. Sweetman, \(30 \overline{5} 5\) N. Meridian St., Apt. \#4A, Indianapolis, Indiana 46208.

\section*{May 17 \& 24 \\ 13TH ANNUAL W. MASS. CHESS TOURNEY}

Restricted to residents of W. Mass. or members of W. Massachusetts clubs, a 6 -round Swiss, \(50 / 2\), will be held at the Plimpton Library, Williston Academy, Payson Ave., Easthampton, Mass. Reg. istration fees, \(\$ 4\) plus USCF membership, must be paid by May 14. Players are requested to bring sets, boards and clocks. Trophy awards. Address entries and inquiries to: Mrs. T. J. Howes, 67 Lawler St., Holyoke, Mass. 01041.

May 17, 24, 31, June 7, efc.

\section*{EVERY-SUNDAY TOURNAMENT}

4-Round Swiss; 40 moves in \(21 / 2\) hours, no adjudications, will be held at the Rossolimo Chess Studio, 191 Sullivan St., N.Y. 12, N.Y. (Grandmaster Rossolimo
will participate). One round each Sunday from 2 P.M. to 7. Please bring clocks. For further information, contact Nicolas Rossolimo at the above address, or GR-5-9737. Registration closes 7 P.M., Sat. USCF membership required. USCF rated.

\section*{May 28.31 \\ 1964 BUCKEYE OPEN}

7 -round Swiss at the Secor Hotel, Jefferson Ave., Toledo, Ohio. Prizes-1st \(\$ 300\); 2nd, \(\$ 200\); 3rd, \(\$ 100\). Merit prizes \(\$ 25\) for each point over \(41 / 2\), junior and class awards. Entry fee: \(\$ 12.50\) seniors ( 18 or older); \(\$ 8.50\) juniors ( 17 or younger). Registration closes 7 P.M. May 28. Advance registration-All persons who enter in advance will receive a free chess book. Do not mail entries after May 18. Send to-Ohio Chess Assn., Box 5268, Cleveland, Ohio.

\section*{May 28-31 \\ UNITED STATES AMATEUR CHAMPIONSHIP}
(see P. 97)

\section*{May 29, 30, 31}

BIRMINGHAM OPEN \& AMATEUR
5 -round Swiss, \(45 / 2\), will be held at the Thomas Jefferson Hotel, Birmingham, Alabama. The open championship is unrestricted and the amateur championship is for 1800 and lower rated players. Entries: Open section \$6; Amateur \$4. Registration closes at 6:45 P.M. and there is an optional first round on Friday (7 P.M.) for those who do not want to play three rounds on Saturday. Cash awards and trophies. Players are requested to bring clocks. For further information write Charles Cleveland, 15th Floor, Empire Bldg., Birmingham 3, Ala.

\footnotetext{
May 29, 30, 31
MISSOURI OPEN
Sponsored by the St. Louis Chess League, a 6 -round Swiss, \(50 / 2\), will start at 7 P.M. at the Downtown YMCA, 1528 Locust St., St. Louis, Mo. Entry fee: \$7. Prizes: 1st \(\$ 100\); 2nd \(\$ 50\); special class prizes. The title of Missouri Open Champion goes to the winner and the title of Missouri State Champion is restricted to the highest finishing Mo. resident. Address advance entries and inquiries to Mr. C. M. Burton, 2217 Thurman Ave., St. Louis, 10, Mo.
}
> \$100 MAKES YOU A USCF MEMBERFOR LIFE!

\section*{IDAHO OPEN}

Sponsored by the Idaho Chess Assn., a 5 -round Swiss, \(50 / 2\), will be held at the Wendell Christensen Community Center, 910 First St. S., Nampa, Idaho. Play is divided into two classes, both rated (registration 9 A.M.).
"A"-Entry: \$3.75. Prizes: 1st., \$50; 2nd., \(\$ 25\); 3rd., \(\$ 10\); highest USCF "B" \(\$ 10\).
"B"-Entry: \$2.75. Trophies for 1st., 2nd., 3rd., and high C or unrated. This section is limited to players under 1850.

For further info: Dick Vandenburg, USCF Regional V.P., 2316 Regan Ave., Boise, Idaho. In addition to the twoclass tournament above, there will be a "Chess For Fun" event.

June 5, 6, 7

\section*{CORAL GABLES OPEN}

5 -round Swiss, \(45 / 2\), will be played at the War Memorial Youth Center, 400 Anastasia Ave., Coral Gables, Fla. and it is to be divided into three sections:an Open, fees \(\$ 5\) ( \(\$ 3\) juniors under 21); an Amateur, fees \(\$ 4\) ( \(\$ 2\) juniors); a Booster (under 1700), fees \(\$ 3\) ( \(\$ 1\) juniors). \(\$ 100\) first prize guaranteed. Other prizes: cash and trophies. Please bring sets and clocks. For further information: Wm. O'Regan, 10720 SW 5th St., Miami, Fla. 33165.

\section*{June 6-7}

\section*{SOUTHWEST LOUISIANA OPEN}

The Lafayette Chess Club is sponsoring this second annual event at the Evangeline Hotel, 302 Jefferson, Lafayette, Louisiana. 5 -round Swiss, \(45 / 2\), with a guaranteed first prize of \(\$ 200\). Additional cash prizes according to entries. Entry fee: \$10. Championship; \$7. Reserve. For further information: W. M. Spaulding, 606 Debby Drive, LaFayette, La.

\section*{June 6, 7}

\section*{MINOT INTERNATIONAL OPEN}

5 -round Swiss, \(50 / 2\), will be held at the Ramada Inn, Minot, North Dakota -registration closes at 8:30 A.M. \$2 of the \(\$ 6\) entry fee will go to the USCF International Affairs Fund. Prizes: 1st \(\$ 25\); 2nd \(\$ 15\); 3rd \(\$ 5\) plus trophies. For further info: Capt. J. T. Bauman, 104-1 Glacier Dr., Minot AFB, N. Dakota. A second, non-rated novice event will be held at the same time. All players are requested to bring sets and clocks.

\section*{OKLAHOMA CITY INTERNATIONAL}

The 5th Annual O.C. Open, a 5 round Swiss, will be sponsored by the Oklahoma State Chess Assn. and directed by F.I.D.E. vice-president Jerry Spann. \$2.00 of the \(\$ 5\). entry fee will be used to help finance U.S. international chess participation.

Location-Pilot Center, 1436 N.W. 2nd., Oklahoma City, Okla. ("air-conditioned and roomy" Jerry says.) Time limit: \(35 / 11 / 2 \mathrm{hrs}\). for rounds \(1-3 ; 40 / 2\), for 4 and 5. Prizes-1st., trophy + \(\$\); trophies to class winners and Upset.

An unrated, Jr. Tourney (17 yrs. and under), no entry fee, will be held concurrently. Registration at 9 A.M. Advance entries and info: Keith R. Carson, 1418 Lafayette Dr., Oklahoma City, Okla.

\section*{June 6-7 VERMONT OPEN}

6 -round Swiss, 40/11/2, registration closes at 9:30 A.M., will be played at the Edwin Lawrence Rec. Center, Court \& Center St., Rutland, Vermont. Entry fee: Class A, \(\$ 5\).; Class B, \(\$ 4\).; Jrs. under 18, \(\$ 4\). Prizes: Class A, \(\$ 50\).; B, \(\$ 20\). For further info, contact the T. D., Ralph Williams, 13 Elm St., West Rutland, Vt.

\section*{June 12-14 \\ ROUND ROBIN OPEN}

5 -game round robin, \(36 / 11 / 2\), will be held at the Chess Center, Masonic Bldg., 3615 Euclid, Cleveland, Ohio, registration 6 P.M. Players will be divided into six player section. The top six rated in Section One, etc. Prizes: \(60 \%\) of entry fees. Entry: \(\$ 4.50\). For further details, contact the Ohio Chess Assn., Box 5268, Cleveland, Ohio.

\section*{June 13, 14 \\ FALLS CITY OPEN}

6 -round Swiss, sponsored by the Louisville Chess Club, will be held at The Mall, Shelbyville Road at Watterson Expressway, Louisville, Kentucky. Entry fee: \$5 plus USCF membership. Prizes1st, \(\$ 50 . ; 2\) nd, \(\$ 20\).; other, by number of entries. Address inquiries to Samuel Fulkerson, Route \#2, Jeffersontown, Kentucky.
\[
\left.\right|_{1} ^{2}
\]

\section*{June 13-14}

NEW YORK STATE AMATEUR CHAMPIONSHIP
5 -round Swiss, \(50 / 2\), will be played at the Hotel Buffalo, Washington and Swan St., Buffalo, N.Y. Entry fee: \$4. + USCF and NYS membership. Registration at 8 A.M. Trophies to classes. For further info: Mr. G. Mauer, 14 Rawlins St., Buffalo, N.Y.

\section*{DOWNEAST OPEN}

The third annual Downeast Open tournament, a 6 -round Swiss, will be played at the Portland, Maine YMCA starting 8 P.M., Friday. Cash prizes plus trophy to the winner. Entry fee: \(\$ 5\) plus USCF membership. For further details contact Stuart Laughlin, 68 Prospect St., Portland, Me.

\section*{June 19, 20}

\section*{BITBURG OPEN}

Sponsored by the European Chess District, a 5-round Swiss, \(45 / 2\), will be held at the Base Service Club, Bitburg Air Force Base, Bitburg, Germany. Entry: \(\$ 3.50\); prizes according to entries. For further information: write the T.D. Mr. David H. Rogers, 8th Mil. Intel. Det., A.P.O. 111, N.Y., N.Y.

\section*{June 27, 28}

\section*{CENTRAL NEW ENGLAND OPEN}

The Fourth Annual Central New England Championship, sponsored by the Wachusett Chess Club, will be held at the First Parish Church Hall, Main St., Upper Common, Fitchburg, Mass. The 6round Swiss, 60/2, starting at 9:30 A.M., will guarantee \(\$ 250\) in cash prizes. Entry fees; Masters \& Experts, \(\$ 10 ;\) A, \(\$ 8\); B, \$7; C, \$6; Unrated, \$6. One dollar reduction if you enter prior to June 23. Please bring sets and clocks. Send all correspondence to: Frank Hacker, 30 Wendell Road, Fitchburg, Mass. 01420 (Diamond-2-7571).

\section*{July 2.5}

\section*{43RD ANNUAL SOUTHERN CHESS OPEN}

Jointly sponsored by the Southern Chess Association and the Huntsville Chess Club, a 7 -round Swiss, \(40 / 2\), will be held at the Town House Motor Hotel, Huntsville, Alabama. Open to all USCF

\section*{1964 LAS VEGAS OPEN CHESS TOURNAMENT}

July 4-5-6-7 - Hotel Sahara - Guaranteed Prizes
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & First & Second & Third & Fourth & Fifth \\
\hline GENERAL & - \$300.00 & + Trophy & \$200.00 & \$100.00 & \[
\$ 50.00
\] & \[
\$ 25.00
\] \\
\hline WOMEN'S JUNIORS & \$ \({ }^{\text {\$ }} 50.00\) & + Trophy & Trophy
\(\$ 50.00\) & \$ 50.00 & & \\
\hline CLASS A & \$200.00 & Trophy & \$100.00 & \$ 50.00 & & \\
\hline CLASS B & \$150.00 & Trophy & \$100.00 & \$ 50.00 & & \\
\hline CLASS C & \$150.00 & + Trophy & \$ 75.00 & \$ 50.00 & & \\
\hline UNRATED & \$100.00 & + Trophy & \$ 50.00 & \$ 25.00 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

No evening Games. Door prize \(\$ 50\). Free coupon books for drinks, meals, gifts. Director: George Koltanowski. Entry Fee \$20. For advance registration write:
611 North Main
ART GAMLIN
Las Vegas, Nevada
and SCA (\$2) members. Entry fees: \(\$ 15\) Championship, \(\$ 10\) Amateur, \(\$ 5\) Reserve. Nearly \(\$ 1,000\) in cash prizes +9 trophies +7 clocks +15 books. Grandmasters Arthur Bisguier and Pal Benko have registered to play. Entries close at 5:00 p.m., July 2. Speed tournament for players who arrive by 11:00 a.m., July 2. Directed by Carroll M. Crull. Early registration and inquiries to Carroll M. Crull, 3706 Vogel Dr., N.W., Huntsville, Alabama 35810.
(See advt. in this issue.)

\title{
July 4-7 \\ LAS VEGAS OPEN \\ (See advt. in this issue.)
}

\section*{July 10-12 \\ U.S. TEAM CHAMPIONSHIP (see p. 102)}

\section*{July 18-19, 25-26}

MINNEAPOLIS AQUATENNIAL
The Minnesota State Chess Association is expanding its program this year, giving chess players the opportunity to take their vacations during the famous Minneapolis Aquatennial Celebration and play in both the 2nd Annual Open and the Region Six Championship. Bring the family. For an Aqua-program, contact George Tiers, c/o Alden Riley, 2095 E. Cowern Pl., N. St. Paul, Minn. For advance entries and further info: write to Mr . Riley.

Match wits with Arthur Bisguier and Pal Benko FORTY-THIRD ANNUAL SOUTHERN OPEN

\section*{July 2-3-4-5}
at Town House Motor Hotel-Huntsville, Alabama
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \$ \$ \$ 1,000.00 \$ \$ \$ \\
& \text { Championship: } \$ 400-\$ 150-\$ 100-\$ 50-\$ 25 \\
& \text { Amateur: } \$ 100-\$ 50-\$ 25-\$ 15 \\
& \text { Reserve: } \$ 20+\text { clock } \$ 10+\text { clock } \\
& \text { Plus gobs of trophies, clocks, and books } \\
& \text { 7-Round Swiss - } 40 \text { moves in } 2 \text { hours } \\
& \text { Registration closes } 5: 00 \text { p.m., July } 2 \\
& \text { Register for speed tournament by 11:00 a.m. } \\
& \text { Inquiries: C. M. Crull, } 3706 \text { Vogel Dr. } \\
& \text { Huntsville, Ala. }
\end{aligned}
\]

\section*{July 18-19}

\section*{2ND ANNUAL MPLS. AQUATENNIAL OPEN}

Registration: 8 A.M., C.S.T. A 5 -round Swiss Open, \(50 / 2\), will be held at the Mpls. Downtown YMCA, 30 S . Ninth St., Minneapolis, Minn. Entry fee: \(\$ 6.00\). Prizes: 1st., \(\$ 100\).; 2nd., \(40 . ; 3\) rd, \(\$ 15\). plus other cash awards and trophies to classes. (A separate, unrated tourney will be held at the same time). Skittles room provided.

\section*{July 25-26}

\section*{REGION SIX CHAMPIONSHIP}

Registration: 8 A.M., C.S.T. Open to all residents of Region Six, a 5 -round Swiss, \(50 / 2\) will be held at the Downtown YMCA. Entry fee: \(\$ 10.00\). Prizes: 1st., \$100.; 2nd., \$75.; 3rd, \$50.; 4th., \$25.plus \(50 \%\) of entry fees above 35 players, divided among the winners.

\section*{July 25}

CHESS TORNADO OPEN
(One-day fournament)
Registration: 8 A.M., C.S.T. A 4 -round Swiss, \(30 / 1\), will be held at the Y, entry fee- \(\$ 5.00\). Prizes: 1st., \(\$ 35\).; 2nd., \(\$ 25\).; 3rd., \(\$ 15\)-plus \(50 \%\) of entry fees above 25 players divided among top 4 and top \(\mathrm{B}, \mathrm{C}\), and Unrated.

The Assn. may also hold Tornadoes on July 18, 19 or 26 , if enough players write and request them.

\section*{July 18.26}

\section*{N.Y. STATE CHAMPIONSHIP}

9 -round Swiss, \(45 / 2^{1 / 2}\), one round daily, will be played at Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y. Entry fee: \(\$ 13\). (plus USCF and NYS membership). Prizes: 1st., \(\$ 200\).; 2nd., \(\$ 100\). ; 3rd, \(\$ 50\).; others. Registration closes 6 P.M., July 18.

\section*{July 25-26 \\ THE ANNUAL GENESEE CUP TEAM MATCH}

4-player teams will compete in a round robin match. N.Y.S. membership required. On July 25, (8 P.M.) the N.Y. State Speed Championship will be held.

For reservations and entries: P. Berlow, Chem. Dept., Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.```

