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 in collaboration with Former World Champion, Dr. Max Euwe, Ernest Gruenfeld, Hans Kmoch, and many other authoritiesThis latest and immense work, the most exhaustive of its kind, explains in encyclopedic detail the fine points of all openings. It carries the reader well into the middle game, evaluates the prospects there and often gives complete exemplary games so that he is not left hanging in mid-position with the query: What happens now?

A logical sequence binds the continuity in each opening. First come the moves with footnotes leading to the key posilion. Then follow pertinent observations, illustrated by "Idea Variations." Finally, Practical and Supplementary Variations, well annotated, exemplify the effective possibilities. Each line is appraised:,+- or $=$.

The large format- $71 / 2 \times 9$ inches-is designed for ease of reading and playing. It eliminates much tiresome shuffling of pages between the principal lines and the respective comments. Clear, legible type and a wide margin for inserting notes are other plus features.

In addition to all else, this book contains 439 complete games- $a$ golden treasury in itself!
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COMING EVENTS IN THE U. S. AND CANADA
Abbreviations-SS Tmt: Swiss System Tournament (in 1st round entries paired by lot or selection; in subsequent rounds players with similar scores paired). RR Tmt: Round Robin Tournament (each man plays every other man). Ko Tmt; Knock-out Tournament (losers or low scorers eliminated), \$\$: Cash prizes. EF: Entry fee. CC Chess Club. CF: Chess Federation. CA: Chess Assocfation. CL: Chess League. Rd: rounds. USCF dues: $\$ 5$ membership per year,

## USCF OPEN

As we go to press, we have no firm press release on the U. S. Chess Federation Open but on latest word received we understand it is to be in university rooms in San Juan, Puerto Rico, July 24 to August 6 with a package cost (including plane fare, rooms, meals) of $\$ 240$.

## MASTERS OPEN <br> Minnesota - June 11 to 13

At the Downtown YMCA, Minneapolis, Minnesota: 5 Rd SS Tmt, 45 moves $/ 21 / 2$ hours, 20 per thereafter, open to rated masters only: $\$ \$ 1$ st $\$ 250,2 \mathrm{~d} \$ 100$, 3d $\$ 50$, more and/or others if $E F s$ swell $\$ \$$ fund: EF $\$ 20$ ( $\$ 10$ if postmarked by May 8) plus USCF dues, checks payable to Minnesota State Chess Association, addressed to R. Ashford, 190841 Av. NE, Minneapolis, Minn. 55421; 1st Rd 7 pm, June 11, latest registration 6:30 PM ; inquiries to G. V. D. Tiers, 165 South Cleve. land, St. Paul 5, Minn.

## Montana - May 8 to 9

30th Annual Tournament of MCA in the Florence Hotel, Missoula, Montana: 5 Rd SS Tmt: 50 moves/ 2 hours: open to all: 3 divisions, Championship; Class

Items printed for benefit of our readers if reported by authorized officials at least two months in advance, and kept to brief essentials. Readers: nearly all tourneys ask your aid by bringing own chess sets, boards and clocks. Also, write for further details for which no space here, but mention you heard through Chess Review!

CHESS REVIEW is published monthly by CHESS REVIEW, 134 W .72 d St., New York, New York 10023. Printed in U. S. A. Reentered as second-class matter August 7 , 1947, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.
General Offices: 134 West 72d Street, New York, N. Y. 10023. Sales Department open daily 9 to $6 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. - Saturdays from 2 to 5 p. m. Telephone: LYceum 5-1620.

B; Junior: trophies to 1 st 2 in each division: EF $\$ 2$ (Juniors under 18 \$1): register by 12 m , May 8 : inquiries to A. D. Hitchcock, 628 South 4 West, Mis. soula, Montana.

## Vermont - May 9 and 16

34th Vermont Championship at Edwin W. Lawrence Recreation Ctr., 86 Center St., Rutland, Vermont: 6 Rd, 3 each Sunday; 40 moves $/ 11 / 2$ hours, then $15 / 1 / 2$ : register before $9: 30 \mathrm{Am}$, May 9, play starts 10: open to all: title to highest Vermont player; \$\$ to lst, highest Junior under 15 \& highest Vermont player, others per EF's, \& Chess Letters (publ) to new entrants: EF $\$ 4$ (juniors $\$ 3$ separate tourney if sufficient entrants): EFs and inquiries to Ralph Williams, West Rutland, Vermont.
Indiana - May 15 to 16
Indiana State Championship at Purdue Memorial Center, Purdue University, West Lafayelle, Indiana, restricted to Hoosiers: 5 Rd SS Tmt, 60 moves/ 2 hours: trophies for 1st three, books for highest A, B \& C, other prizes: EF $\$ 5$ (under 19, $\$ 2.50$ ): advance EFs \& inquiries to J. Kalan, 6-4 Ross Ade Dr., W. Lafayette, Indiana.
The Indianapolis Open is cancelled.

## Illinois - May 28 to 31

The 1965 Illinois Open at North Park Hotel, Chicago: 7 Rd SS Tmt, starts 7 PM, May 28. then $2 \mathrm{Rd} /$ day, $11 \mathrm{Am} \& 6$ PM: $\$ \$$ lst $3, \$ 300, \$ 200 \& \$ 100$, also $\$ \$$ in all classes \& merit $\$ \$$, total fund over $\$ 1650$ : spectator fee $\$ 1 /$ Rd: EF $\$ 14$ ( $\$ 9$ under 19) less $\$ 1$ if revd before May 28: advance EFs \& inquiries to F. Skoff, 1400 Warner St., Chicago, Illinois 60613.

## Alabama - May 29 to 31

$2 d$ Annual Heart of Dixie Open at Russel Erskine Hotel, Huntsville, Alabama: 6 Rd SS Tmt, 45 moves $/ 2$ hours: register by $11 \mathrm{AM}: \mathrm{EF} \$ 8: \$ \$ 1$ st $\$ 65$; Amateur Division (for below 1900 ratings) ; EF $\$ 6$, Ist $\$ 25 ; \& 5$ trophies \& 5 merchandise prizes: inquiries to C. M. Crull, 3706 Vogel Dr., Huntsville, Alabama.
New Mexico - May 29 to 30
1965 Albuquerque Open in the Community Room, East Central Branch, Albuquerque National Bank, Washington \& Central NE, Albuquerque, New Mexico: 5 Rd SS Tmt, 45 moves/ 2 hours ( $40 / 11 / 2$, 1st Rd) : trophies to 1st 3; medals, 1st B, Junior \& Upset: EF $\$ 5$ (juniors in HS or lower, \$1) plus USCF dues: Albuquer-
(Concluded on page 134)

Subscription Rates: One year $\$ 6.50$, two years $\$ 12.00$, three years $\$ 15.75$, world-wide. Change of Address: Six weeks' notice required. Please furnish an address stencil impression from the wrapper of a recent issue. Address changes cannot be made without the old address as well as the new one. Unsolicited manuscripts and photographs will not be returned unless accompanied by return postage and self-addressed envelope. Distributed nationally by Eastern News.


PREPARE TO MATE:
With June coming on, don't mistake us, we admonish, scotchingly! Our intentions are spiritually caissic, we add, wryly; and, although you may take a purely Bourbon attitude, in a decanting manner, make a ball for yourself, high or low, of this quiz. But 'ware the gin! For ten correct solutions, score excellent; for eight, good; for six, fair.

Solutions on page 137
3. White to move and mate

4 Black to move and mate


Wit and sagacity may be, as some claim, synonymous. Maybe-but there is a dif. ference. This position, as opposed to the last, definitely demands sagacity rather than wit, we wot. What say you? First unriddle this problem, though. Can you?

7 White to move and mate


That was fun, was it not? Remember, however, that mate is such suite sorrow for the loser. And note, moreover, that, if you desire to induce Black to a like mood here, you need to move with dispatch, if not outright dash, into the suite. Yes?


If Black is to mate here, all we can say, logically, is that, if he had any more pieces en prise, White must then already be mated. He's not, however; so the fum is all yours. And it is fun, we (but with unmitigated gall?) trust. So go after it, we say, conjugally!

8 Black to move and mate


To accomplish your wanted solution in this particular situation, you may need to scour the whole suite with unwonted perspicacity. Or you may be well on the way to making White quite sour with but one coup d'oeil. The point is: mate, mate!


In the merrie month of May you may take down a perfect score. At least the sap has been running for some time now. So if you're there sitting at the board, and not bored, you ought to have the capability to ensnare Black's King here. Can you?

5 White to move and mate

"Conjugation" may be an unfortunate term for those who struggled with French verbs (or others) in the otherwise halcyon days of schooling. Well, shall we say: Conjoin Black's King? It's really only a simple trick. That is, if you see it. Do you?

9 White to move and mate


With Rook, Bishop and Pawn for Queen, do you suppose, the Walrus said, White could win in seven years? The odds are stated, but not the time-unless you're a mighty dilatory thinker: Fashion an immediate termination. This is your meat. Isn't it?


Here you have a wideopen board and White's King well out in-we were going to say "clear," but that term does not seem to apply, At least that term will not, if you demonstrate the appropriate quality: to wit, wit! Ah, go along wit cha!

6 Black to move and mate


Very well then, we shall stick to chess and strictly chessic terms: the conditions appertaining to the concurrent situation foster our insistent requirement that you so conduct Bjack's maneuvers as to checkmate the White King. Or just mate, mate!

10 Black to move and mate


One man's meat is another man's poison. What's a mate to one man is just a person to another. But let's not ascend to personalities at this conjuncture. Make this pos. tion your meat, or mate, and skip the poison (or person). In playin' terms, just mate. But how?

## INTERNATIONAL

## Grand Old Master

Though far from being the oldest grandmaster extant, Miguel Najdorf of Argentina played that part at Mar del Plata and still surpassed a largely grandmaster field, including two representatives of the Soviet Union.
Najdorf scored $121 / 2$ points out of a possible 15. Leonid Stein and Yuri Averbakh of the Soviet Union followed with 11 and $101 / 2$. And three tied at $91 / 2$ : Julio Bolbochan and Oscar Panno of Argentina, and Pal Benko of the United States.

Florin Ghiorghiu of Roumania placed seventh with 9 points, and plus scores were turned in by Raul Sanguinetti, $81 / 2$, and Hector Rossetti, 8, both of Argentina. The following trailed: R. C. Cruz and R. Garcia (Argentina) 6; Herman Pilnik (Chile) $5 \frac{1}{2}$; and four Argentinians: V. Palermo 5, Carlos Bielicki $31 / 2$, J. Benrensen and A. Foguelman, each 3 .

## Event in Italy

At Reggio Emilia in Italy, a round robin resulted in a fourfold tie for first when the Yugoslavs Bertok and Minich, the Hungarian Bilek and West German Teschner each tallied $81 / 2 \cdot 21 / 2$. The Czech Kozma finished with $8-3$, and a relatively low-scoring contingent of seven players was headed by Palmiotto of Italy, $51 / 2-51 / 2$.

## North African Note

O'Kelly de Galway of Belgium disported himself in Tunisia, where he piled up a 10-1 score, followed by Karaklajich of Yugoslavia, 9-2. The Tunisian Belkadi did well in third place with $71 / 2-31 / 2$.

## Challengers Round

In the round of matches to produce the next Challenger for the World Championship, Yefim Geller is to take the place ceded by former world champion Botvinnik, and the playing schedules have been officially announced, to this extent:

Paul Keres and Boris Spassky of the Soviet Union begin their match in Riga, April 7. Vassily Smyslov and Geller start on April 17. Geller was allowed and took a ten-day postponement, under FIDE rules, on the grounds that he was noti-
fied of his right to participate as late as March eleventh. The winners of these matches are to meet in Leningrad at the end of May or the beginning of June. The first matches are for ten games each.

Mikhail Tahl of the Soviet Union and Lajos Portisch of Hungary, and Bent Larsen of Denmark and Borislay Ivkov of Yugoslavia begin their ten-game matches in Yugoslavia on June 27. The winners of these matches play off in August.

## UNITED STATES

## REGIONAL and INTERSTATE

## Giant Gathering

Featuring a record turrout of 191 chess enthusiasts, the Greater Chicago Open, otherwise known as the Sam Cohen Memorial Tourney, was won by Ed Formanek. Paul Tautvaisas and Al Sandrin matched Formanek's 7.1 score, but placed behind him in second and third respectively on tiebreaks. Scores of $61 / 2-11 / 2$ were notched by grandmaster Robert Byrne, John Tums, Vasa Kostic, Angelo Sandrin, Ed Vano and George Berry.

## Inside the Golden Triangle

The Golden Triangle Open, held in Pittsburgh, went to Martin S. Lubell, 4-1, on a median basis. The latter tiebreak system gave second and third respectively to Richard Kause and Steve Caruthers, both of whom equaled Lubell's 4-1. There were 49 participants.

## Trek to Connecticut

In the Connecticut Amateur Open, which attracted 36 entrants from a wide area, the victor was Douglas Grant of New York with a clear first of 5-1. Next were William Newberry, Anthony Miller and Steven Morrison at $41 / 2-11 / 2$, who finished in that two to four order on tiebreaks.

## The Crimson All the Way

Harvard University dominated the New England Intercollegiate Team championship by sweeping five rounds. American International College surprised as runnerup in front of the strong military
school, Norwich University, while the University of Massachusetts placed fourth.

## Deeds in Dayton

We learn from the Dayton Chess Club Review that the Midwest Open Team Festival was won by the Dayton Chess Club team of four in a "thrilling last-minute 'squeaker.'" Going into the fifth and final round, Dayton was trailing the Indianapolis YMCA group by a half point in match scores. A valiant team effort enabled DCC to triumph with a final 4.1 tally, leaving the Indianapolis YMCA and the Ohio State University "A" team tied for second at $31 / 2-1^{1} / 2$. Dayton team members were E. Lawrence, T. Mantiam, D. V. Burk and J. Phythyon.

## ARIZONA

According to a dispatch from the active Phoenix Chess Club, a national attendance record was probably established for officially sanctioned high school tournaments when no less than 172 youngsters participated in the Fourth Annual Arizona High School Championship. Thirteen of these were girls. Team winners turned out to be representatives of Prescott Senior High, while Mark Litterman of Phoenix Camelback High become new state high school titlist and Kathryn Zetterlund of Phoenix West High made it two years in a row to take the girls' championship.

## GEORGIA

The Georgia State Open, staged in Macon, was won by Vernon Robinson with a clear first of $41 / 2^{-1 / 2}$. Runnerup in the 22 player shindig was William A. Scott, 4-1.

## LOUISIANA

In the Louisiana State Chess League, the New Orleans squad was victorious with a $21 / 2.1 / 2$ match record. Slidell, 2-1, came in second.
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On the cover, Emma Walker has just thrown a Bishop and an Options symbol; and, strangely enough, everyone looks pleased. Above, Pal Benko appears dissatisfied with his throw. Fun Chess was tried at the Stardust during the National Open. Others on cover (left to right): Herman Estrada, Art Gamlin, Joanne Estrada and Meryl Gamlin.

At Vegas Fun Chess dice and rules are packaged by the Nevada Dice Co. in an attractive plastic case. You need a chess set and board, though. One die shows symbols for King, Rook, Bishop, Knight and two Pawns; the other, Queen, Rook, Bishop, Knight, Pawn and Options. White rolls the two dice; if he can move on either symbol, he must; if not, he loses his turn. Then Black takes his turn.

On the Options die, the player can make any legal move or declare, "I pass." Castling, if legal, can occur when a K turns up. A player in check responds legally without tossing dice. There are other special rules; too many to give here.

Larry Evans says of Fun Chess: "It's fast and fun-combining skill with gamble. The better player will win in the long run. But the handicap of the game itself continually makes things interesting for both opponents. My strategy is to gamble only when things look hopeless."

## NEBRASKA

Representatives of Central High School of Omaha gathered premier honors in both team and individual competition in the Nebraska Scholastic Tournament. Central's "A" team easily outdistanced Scottsbluff's "A," and Don Rogers was declared individual titleholder when his was the only $5-0$ sweep among the seventy-two players.

## NEW JERSEY

Ninety-five players converged on Atlantic City to vie for the South Jersey Open championship. When the fracas was over, the strong master James Gore, noted for his imaginative and enterprising style, could show $51 / 2$ points out of a possible 6 to emerge a clear first. Scores of 5-1 were made by George Krauss, Jr., Larry Gilden, Alan G. Baisley, Arnold Chertkof, Sergei Goregliad and Miro Radoicic.

## NEW YORK

Returning to the wars after an absence of some years, the redoubtable Herbert Seidman won his sixth Marshall Chess Club championship with an undefeated $61 / 2 \cdot 11 / 2$. The always notable Marshall tille tournament was distinguished this year for two exceptional reasons: it was the club's "Fiftielh Anniversary Championship" and it was the first title tournament to be run on a Swiss basis. In order to clinch his victory, Seidman (incidentally celebrating his personal "Twenty-fifth Anniversary" in chess) had to overcome his long-standing nemesis, Sidney Bernstein, in the last round. This he did in good style, breaking a jinx he had become almost resigned to during the past dozen years. Other leading scores were made by 0 . Popovych, $51 / 2-21 / 2$, and Paul Robey and Asa Hoffmann, each 5-3. There were 16 players.
The Greater New York Open, held at the Henry Hudson Hotel in New York City, was won jointly by Pal Benko and Paul Brandts, each 6-0. Walter Shipman, half a point behind, took third. Noteworthy was the huge attendance-a rec-ord-breaking 206.

1965 Marshall Chess Club "Anniversary" Championship

| Players | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Totals | W | D L |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 Herbert Seidman | D10 | W13 | W2 | D6 | D3 | W9 | W5 | W7 | $6 \frac{1}{2}-1 \frac{1}{2}$ | 5 | 30 |
| 2 Orest Popovych | W14 | L6 | L1 | D11 | W16 | W10 | W9 | W3 | $5 \frac{1}{2}-2 \frac{1}{2}$ | 5 | 12 |
| 3 Paul Robey | W15 | W9 | D6 | W12 | D1 | D5 | D7 | L2 | $5-3$ | 3 | 41 |
| 4 Asa Hoffmann | L6 | W14 | D10 | D9 | D7 | W12 | W8 | D5 | 5-3 | 3 | 41 |
| 5 William Goichberg | L9 | W7 | D15 | W8 | W6 | D3 | L. | D4 | $4 \frac{1}{2}-3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 3 | 32 |
| 6 Andrew Soltis | W4 | W2 | D3 | D1 | L5 | L7 | D14 | W16 | $4 \frac{1}{2}-3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 3 | 32 |
| 7 Sidney Bernstein | D11 | L5 | W13 | W15 | D4 | W6 | D3 | L1 | $4 \frac{1}{2}-3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 3 | 32 |
| 8 Edmar Mednis | D13 | W10 | L12 | L5 | W11 | W14 | L4 | W15 | $4 \frac{1}{2}-3 \frac{1}{2}$ | 4 | 13 |
| 9 James T. Sherwin | W5 | L3 | W11 | D4 | W12 | L1 | L2 | D10 | 4-4 | 3 | 23 |
| 10 Dr. Adolph Stern | D1 | 18 | D4 | D14 | W13 | L2 | W16 | D9 | 4-4 | 2 | 42 |
| 11 Hyman Schneid | D7 | D12 | $L 9$ | D2 | L8 | W16 | L13 | W14 | $3 \frac{1}{2}-4 \frac{1}{2}$ | 2 | 33 |
| 12 Walter S. Browne | W16 | D11 | W8 | 13 | L9 | L4 | L15 | W13 | $3{ }_{2}^{1}-4 \frac{1}{2}$ | 3 | 14 |
| 13 Allan Kaufman | D8 | L1 | L7 | W16 | L10 | W15 | W11 | L. 12 | 312.41 | 3 | 14 |
| 14 Theodore Lorie | L2 | L4 | W16 | D10 | W15 | L8 | D6 | L11 | 3-5 | 2 | 24 |
| 15 Louis Levy | L3 | W16 | D5 | L7 | L14 | L13 | W12 | L8 | $2 \frac{1}{2}-5 \frac{1}{2}$ | 2 | 15 |
| 16 Richard Glickman | L12 | L16 | L14 | L13 | L2 | L11 | L10 | L6 | 0-8 | 0 | 08 |

Alaska. We learn from Chess Life that the Willard Fiske Chess Club, which was demolished in the terrible earthquake of March, 1964, has been replaced by the Anchorage Chess Rookery. This newly formed unit sponsored the Fur Rendezvous Open, in which Henry Divis predominated with a perfect $6-0$. Runnerup with $5-1$ was David Jones, whose only loss was to the tournament winner. There were 28 players.
California. Top banana in 48 player Santa Monica Open was William Addison, $6-0$. Norman Lessing and Ed Kennedy were next with 5-1 each, Another Santa Monica affair saw undefeated Charles Henin breeze in with 7-1, ahead of Ed Kennedy, 6-2. This tourney was a masters' and experts' round robin.
In the first El Segundo Open, attended by 57 contestants including a mysterious "Mr. X," the top scorers were L. Simon and W. Cunningham, each $51 / 2-1 / 2$. Simon took first on a tiebreak.
The Herman Steiner and the Santa Monica Bay clubs are generally considered the strongest chess organizations in California, so that exceptional importance attached to a clash between the two. Santa Monica won, somewhat surprisingly, by the good margin of $91 / 2-61 / 2$. Our news report comes from Herb Abel and Ed Kennedy, who tell us that the interest generated by this event may well develo ${ }_{F}$ into an annual West Coast fixture, much like the traditional New York rivalry beIween the Manhattan and Marshall Chess Clubs. Santa Monica winners were L. Simon, A. Spiller, Ed Kennedy, P. Quillen. I. Levitan and F. McReynolds. For the Steiner Club, the victors were I. Rivise, M, Gordon and N. Robinson. Seven games were drawn.
First spot in a 2 man collegiate team tournament held at UCLA was seized by the Berkeley pair, D. Sutherland and N. Weaver, with 34 game points. Stanford trailed in second place four points behind.
Cotorado. Denver recently was the scene of two important tournaments. First to be held was the Central Bank Tournament, which drew a flock of 50 players. Rudolf Petters was a clear first with $51 / 2-1 / 2$, followed by runnerup Dennis Naylin, 5-1. Monty Mir-Hosseini also scored 5-1, but was relegated to third place on a tiebreak. A second Denver event was the 19 player George Washington Birthday Tournament, won by Dennis Naylin with a score of $41 / 2-1 / 2$. E. Victor Trailbush, 4-1, came in second.

Illinois. At the Forest City Open in Rock. ford, R. Wenzel, R. Tobler Jr. and J. Gibbs topped a 40 player field with $41 / 2$ $1 / 2$ apiece. They finished in the one-twothree order indicated above on tiebreaks.

Indiana. Thirteen-year-old Rony Adelsman won the Indianapolis Junior crown one full point ahead of a trio consisting of Bernard Parham, Fred Newhinney and Steve Cassady. Thirty-three players took part.
Kansas. Playing in the Flint Hills Open at Emporia, John Allen, Bob Beitling, Mike Downs, Mike Davidson and James Dukelow, each 4-1, finished in that order on S.-B. totals. Nineteen other entrants completed the field.
Maine. The Colby team dominated college chess in Maine this season, defeating Bates by 5-1 and Bowdoin by 4-2. Colby also scored a $41 / 2-11 / 2$ victory over the Waterville Chess Club and broke even in a pair of matches against Norwich University of Vermont. Steve Brudno, 5-0, made the best individual showing.
Michigan. Main results of the 1965 Motor City Invitational, a round robin held in Detroit: Carl Driscoll, 9-1; Kazys Skema and Mark Pence, $8-2$ each; Jack Witeczek, 6-4.
Missouri. In the Greater Kansas City Championship, Robert E. Hart registered an unbeatable $5-0$, in front of the 4-1 scores turned in by Virgil Harris and Mike Davidson. A tiebreak gave second to Harris in the 22 player meet.
Nebraska. The combined Omaha City Championship and Ludwig Memorial Tournament saw Roger Anderson in first place with four wins and two draws. Howard Ohman and John Tomas were next with $41 / 2-1 \frac{1}{2}$ each.
New York. From a plethora of local events in this state we glean the following.

At the renowned Manhattan Chess Club, Alexander Kevitz was first with $7-1$ in the Sunday "Master Prelim." John W. Collins, $51 / 2-21 / 2$, placed second ahead of Arthur Feuerstein on a tie-breaking basis. Kevitz and Collins thus qualify for the Manhattan finals together with winners of other "Master Prelim" sections, namely E. S. Jackson, Nat Halper and Adolph Stern.

At the Marshall Chess Club, another celebrated New York chess organization, sixteen-year-old Douglas Pader surprised a strong 26 man field with a thumping 8-1 victory to capture the club's Candidates' Tournament, Pader, two full points ahead of his nearest rival, automatically qualified for next year's championship finals. Evidently the young man bears watching.

Joseph Balint won the championship of the Queens Chess Club in New York City when he nosed out E. S. Jackson on a tiebreak. Both players scored 6-1.

The title tournament of the Kingsmen Chess Club in Brooklyn went to John Evans, 8-1. Alvin Williams, 7-2, was runnerup in the 10 player round robin.

No effective resistance in the Long Island Chess League could be mustered against the Queens Chess Club, which brushed the opposition off the boards with a 7.0 triumph in match points. Members of the winning team were B. Hill, J. Balint, E. S. Jackson, J. Kader, S. Freed, E. Zinberg, A. Wilensky and J. Birnhak.

In upstate doings, the Schenectady Chess Club topped the Hudson Valley Chess League with a match score of $41 / 2$. $1 / 2$. Albany came in second with 4-1. A second upstate competition was the Cornell Invitational Team Matches, Section "A" of which was won by Finger Lakes with a $71 / 2-4 \frac{1}{2}$ game record. Runnerup was Corning, $61 / 2-51 / 2$.
North Dakota. The Sioux Chess Club of Grand Forks downed North Dakota State University by a tally of $4-2$. On first board V. C. Bragg of Grand Forks defeated a formidable adversary, Stephan Popel.

Tennessee. John L. Hutton and David E. Burris both scored $4-1$ in the East Tennessee Open, with Hutton obtaining first prize on a tiebreak.
Texas. In the Alamo Open, William Bills, Peter Gould and David Lees each scored $41 / 2-1 / 2$, but Bills won out substantially on a tiebreak.

The San Jacinto Open was pocketed by Eric Bone, $41 / 2-1 / 2$. George Smith posted the same score but fell back to second place on S.B. considerations.

W'ashington. In the Spokane City Closed Tournament, Gordon Cornelius held all the trumps and finished with a resplendent $5-0$. He eclipsed his nearest rival by $11 / 2$ points.
A headline in the Northwest Chess Letter says, "Golden Horde Glitters." And so they did in winning the Puget Sound League with a $491 / 2-91 / 2$ game score. The defending champions, the Boeing Chess Club, narrowly missed a successful defense of their title when they finished half a point behind. Both teams had 6.0 match records.
Wisconsin. The Northeastern Wisconsin Closed Championship, which drew 16 entries, was won by Peter B. Webster on a tiebreak. His 4-1 game score was matched by Andrew C. Berry and James Blakeslee.

## CANADA

## Quebec

Playing at the University of Montreal, the University of Toronto regained the Eastern Canadian Intercollegiate team

## An Original Approach to Chess Strategy PAWN POWER

 IN CHESSby HANS KMOCH

FUNDAMENTAL ELEMENTS of Pawn play are keys to chess strategy, govern the game by remote control. Basic relationships between Pawns and pieces illustrate how each can show to best advantage.

The author of this profound book defines a completely new set of terms which vigorously delineate the outstanding features of Pawn configura-
 tions and their significance. Originally published in Berlin, the book met with instant acclaim: "A sensational book . . . a primer of chess strategy unparalleled since Nimzovich's My System . . . we consider it the best publication on chess strategy since the end of World War II." - Die Welt. "The publication of this outstanding book constitutes a turning point in the history of modern chess literature . . . can be highly recommended to players of all strengths."-Aachener Volkszeitung. "Kmoch's masterful explanation makes it perfectly clear to the beginner as well as to the advanced player how the fate of a game depends on Pawn formation. A textbook of the first order." - ArbeiterZeitung. "One of the few books which, at a glance, one can recognize as an immortal." - Chess.
304 pages, 182 diagrams
\$5.50
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DAVID McKAY COMPANY, Inc., 750 Third Av., New York, N. Y. 10017
title with a 36.12 game score. Runnerup was the Sir George Williams group, $311 / 2-161 / 2$.

## FOREIGN

## Australia

A tie for the Australian junior title between W. Kerr and Ralph Shaw was resolved in favor of the former when he gained a 3-1 play-off victory.

## Austria

In the contest for the Viennese title, Dueckstein easily outstripped his oppo-
sition by scoring $121 / 2-21 / 2$. His nearest rival Beni was two points behind.

## England

David Levy became London junior titleholder, ahead of Parr, Strauss and Vaughan.

## France

The Rating Tournament of the USCF's European Chess District at Chateauroux Air Station was won by Gilbert Ramirez, $61 / 2-1 / 2$.

## South Africa

In the Cape Town Championship finals, G. Dean proved unbeatable with a 5.0
slam, far ahead of runnerup A. N. Rubinstein, $31 / 2-11 / 2$.

The Claremont title event was won by W. S. Mackie and F. N. Rodrigues, bracketed at $81 / 2 \cdot 21 / 2$.

## Sovieł Union

Women's world champion Nona Gaprindashvili acquired the USSR Women's Championship with a 15.4 tally, finishing two full points ahead of a trio of other contestants.

The Russian team championship, played in Moscow, saw the "Trud" group in first place. Botvinnik was a star representative.

## TOURNAMENT CALENDAR

(Concluded from page 129)
que title to resident: inquiries to Don Wilson, 724 Washington NE, Albuquerque, New Mexico.
New York - June 11 to 13
5 th Annual Hudson Valley Open at Elementary School, Rt. 375, Woodstock, New York: 5 Rd SS Tmt, starts 8 pm , June 11: EF $\$ 10$ (juniors 18 and under, \$5) plus USCF dues; $\$ 8$ (\& $\$ 4$ ) if posted by June 8: \$S lst $\$ 100$ guaranteed; trophies, and other $\$ \$$ to be announced before play begins: inquiries to John D. Mager, Box 838, Springtown Rd., Tillson, New York.

## Maine - June 18 to 20

4th Annual Downeast Open at the YMCA, Portland, Maine: 6 Rd SS Tmt, starts 8 PM: EF $\$ 5$ plus USCF dues: $\$ 8$ plus trophy to winner: inquiries to Stuart Laughlin, 68 Prospect St., Portland, Maine.
New York - June 19 to 20
New York State Amateur Championship at Sherrill Hall, Hobart College, Geneva, New York: 5 Rd SS Tmt, 50 moves $/ 2$ hours: register by $9: 30$ Ant, June 19 , play starts 10 Am : open to all below USCF master: EF $\$ 5$ plus USCF and NYSCA dues: title and trophy to winner, plaques to next two and to highest in A, B, \& C plus Unrated: room at $\$ 3$ night: inquiries, advance EFs and room reservations to R. L. La Belle, On. tario St., Phelps, New York.

## Illinois-June 26 to 27

4th Annual Fox Valley Open at Fox Valley Park District's center, 89 South La Salle St., Aurora, Illinois: 5 Rd SS Tml, 50 moves/ 2 hours: register by 10 am, June 26: $\$ 100$ minimum lst guaranteed, also $\$ \$$ to expert, A, B, C, D \& unrated: EF \$7: inquiries to J. M. Fuller, 525 Penn. Av., Aurora, Illinois.

## Western Open Moves

Note the famed, annual Western Open is in St. Louis this year: see Missouri July 1 to 5 , above.

## Massachusetts - June 26 to 27

5th Annual Central New England Open at Hotel Raymond, Fitchburg, Massachusetts: 6 Rd SS Tmt, 60 moves $/ 2$ hours: starts 9:30 am, June 26: EF prior to June 22 , masters \& experts $\$ 9$, Class A $\$ 8, \mathrm{~B}$ $\$ 7, \mathrm{C} \&$ unrated $\$ 6$ (after June 22, $\$ 1$ more) plus USCF dues: $\$ \$$ guaranteed fund is $\$ 422$; lst $\$ 125$ \& numerous other $\$ \$$ : inquiries and advance EFs to G. Mirijanian, 46 Beacon St., Fitchburg, Massachusetts.

## Washington - June 26 to 27

3d Annual Evergreen Empire Open at Fircrest Community Center, 555 Contra Costa Blvd., Tacoma, Washington: 6 Rd SS Tmt, 50 moves $/ 2$ hours: register by 9 Am, June 26: EF $\$ 5$ plus USCF \& WCF dues or to Reserves (under 1800 rating) $\$ 3$ \& WCF dues ( $\$ 2$ ): $\$ \$ 1$ st $\$ 50$ plus excess over expenses, 2d $\$ 30 \& 3 \mathrm{~d} \$ 20$; Reserves, trophies to top two and top Class C: inquiries and advance EFs to J. R. Ward, 3909 No. 34 St., Tacoma, Washington 98407.

Missouri - July 1 to 5
9th Western Open at Sheraton-Jefferson Hotel, St. Louis, Missouri: 9 Rd SS Tmt, 50 moves $/ 21 / 2$ hours: register by 7 pm , July 1, play starts $8 \mathrm{pm}, 2$ Rd 12 m \& 7 Pm , July 2 through 5: EF $\$ 15$ (juniors $\$ 12.50$ ) plus USCF dues: $\$ \$ 1$ st $\$ 500$, $2 \mathrm{~d} \$ 300,3 \mathrm{~d} \$ 175$ \& merit prizes of $\$ 12.50$ for each half-point over $51 / 2$ points \& trophies to lst unrated \& to 1st \& 2nd Women, Junior \& Class A, B, C \& D: inquiries to Lackland H. Bloom, 506 Olive Street, St. Louis, Missouri 63101.

## Florida-July 2 to 5

44th Southern Open at Cape Colony Inn, Cocoa Beach, Cape Kennedy, Florida: 7 Rd SS Tmt, 50 moves/ 2 hours, then $15 / 30 \mathrm{~min}$ : register by 7 Pm, July 2 : in 3 divisions: Open Championship EF $\$ 15$ plus USCF \& SCA dues: $\$ \$ \$ 300$ guaranteed for lst \& rotating trophy; 2nd \& 2d $\$ 150$ \& $\$ 75$ \& trophies, books to plus scores: Amateur (under 1900 rating) EF $\$ 10$ \& USCF \& SCA dues: $\$ \$ \$ 100$, $\$ 50$ \& $\$ 25$ \& trophies, \& books as above:

Reserve (under 1600 \& unrated) EF s8 \& SCA dues: $\$ 20$ \& trophy to 1st: also Speed Tournament: EF \$2, trophy: more \$ $\$$ as EFs permit; special deductions \& lodging rates; for details write; R. G. Cole, Lot 8, 837 Forrest Av., Cocoa, Florida.

## Ohio - July 17 to 18

8th Annual Cincinnati Open at Central Parkway YMCA, 1105 Elm St., Cincinnati: 5 Rd SS Tmt; 45 moves $/ 11 / 2$ hours, 17th; 50/2, 18th: EF $\$ 7.50$ (juniors under 18 \$6) plus USCF dues (less $\$ 1$ if received by July 13, other discounts to OSCA members) : $\$ \$$ per at least $70 \%$ EFs, 1 for each 10 entries \& each $2 / 3$ of preceding higher: advance EFs \& inquiries to D. Taylor, 706 Mt. Hope St., Cincinnati 45204.

## New York - July 24 to August 1

New York State Chess Congress at the Statler Inn, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York: State Championship 9 Rd SS Tmt, 50 moves $/ 21 / 2$ hours: $\$ \$ \$ 200, \$ 100$, $\$ 50$. $\$ 25$, and trophies to state, upstate, junior and woman champions: register by 5:30 pm, July 24: EF $\$ 15$ plus USCF \& NYSCA dues: Reserve Championship like main event but separate if enough entries, which must be in by June 15: EF $\$ 10$ plus NYSCA dues: trophy, $\$ \$$ : Speed Championship, 7 pm , July 28: $10 \mathrm{sec}-$ onds 1 move: EF \$1: \$8: Team Championship for teams of four from NYS CCs affiliated to NYSCA ( $\$ 5$ annual dues): 2 Rd, July 31; 2, Aug. 1st: individual EFs, NYSCA membership: for accommodations (various discounts), David Rickard, 1152 Ellis Hollow Road, Ithaca, New York 14850; general inquiries: P. P. Berlow, 103 McGraw Place, Ithaca, New York 14850.

## South Dakota - August 28 to 29

1965 South Dakota Open, Community Room, City Hall, Pierre, South Dakota: 5 Rd SS Tmt. 40 moves $/ 2$ hours: register by USCF dues, \& 8 am: EF $\$ 5$ plus SDSCA dues ( $\$ 2$ ) : $8890 \%$ of EFs to top 3, trophy to lst: inquiries to R. Wallace, $13271 / 2$ East Dakota, Pierre, South Dakota,

## WHERE TO PLAY CHESS

## PHOENIX CHESS CLUB

Phoenix Adult Center, 1101 West Washggton St., Phoenix, Arizona: Tuesday \& riday 7:30 PM; phone then $262-6471$

LITTLE ROCK CHESS CLUB
Sam Spike's Insurance Office, Village Center Mall, Little Rock, Arkansas LO-52372, Asher and Univ. Friday 1 PM
berkeley ymca chess club 2001 Allston Way, Berkeley 4, California: Phone: 848-6800
Meets Wednesdays at 7 PM
GARDEN GROVE CHESS CLUB
Euclid Park Recreation Center, Euclid at Stanford, Garden Grove, California Meets every Wednesday at 7 PM

PLUMMER PARK CHESS CLUB 7377 Santa Monica Blvd.
Hollywood, California
Meets every Monday and Friday
CITY TERRACE CHESS CLUB
1126 North Hazard Street
Los Angeles 63, California
Meets Wednesday 7 to 12 PM
HERMAN STEINER CHESS CLUB 8801 Cashio Street
Los Angeles 35, California
OAKLAND YMCA CHESS CLUB 2101 Telegraph Ave., Oakland, California 94612: Phone: 451-5711 ?pen Fridays at 7 PM

BROWARD COUNTY CHESS CLUB 1440 Chateau Park Rd, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida: Mondays 7 PM "till morning" in Lauderdale Manors Recreation Ctr.

ORLANDO CHESS CLUB
Sumshine Park
Orlando, Florida
Open evenings from seven PM on
ST. PETERSBURG CHESS CLUB, Inc. 540 Fourth Avenue N
St. Petersburg, Florida

## CHESS UNLIMITED

4747 North Harlem, Chicago, Illinois Friday 8 PM to 1 AM, Phone: GL 3-4267 H. C. Stanbridge, Pres.

## CHICAGO CHESS CLUB

64 East Van Buren Street
Chicago 5, Illinois
Phone: WE 9-9515
GOMPERS PARK CHESS CLUB
4222 W. Foster, Chicago 30, Illinois
Fridays 7:30 PM - 11:45 PM
Phone: PE 6-4338
OAK PARK CHESS CLUB
Stevenson Fieldhouse, Taylor and
Lake Streets, Oak Park, Illinois Meets Wednesday evenings

INDIANAPOLIS CHESS CLUB Sheraton-Lincoln, 117 W. Washington, Indianapolis, Indiana: Fri. 6-12 PM; Sat. noon- 12 PM; Sun. noon-9 PM

PORTLAND CHESS CLUB
YMCA, 70 Forest Avenue
Portland, Maine
Meets every Friday night.
SPRINGFIELD CHESS CLUB
Meets every Thursday, 7 PM at the AFL-CIO Hq, 221 Dwight Street Springfield, Massachusetts

EAST BRUNSWICK CHESS CLUB
VFW Hall, Cranbury Road, East
Brunswick, New Jersey: phone: 254-9674
Meets every Wednesday night
ELIZABETH CHESS CLUB
Mahon Playground, So. Broad St. near St. James Church, Elizabeth, New Jersey Meets Monday and Friday evenings
JERSEY CITY YMCA CHESS CLUB
654 Bergen Avenue, Jersey City, N. J.
Meets at 7:30 PM
Every Tuesday and Friday
THE KING'S CHESS CLUB
896 Bergen Av., Jersey City, N. J.
Daily 4 PM to 2; Sat., Sun. \& Holidays
2 PM to $2: 65 \mathrm{c}$ admission: free games
LOG CABIN CHESS CLUB
(Founded 1934)
At the home of E. Forry Laucks
30 Collamore Terrace
West Orange, New Jersey
Champions of the N. Y. "Met" League. 1948.
Organized and founded the North Jersey Chess League and Inter-chess League. First to help in large scale inter-state matches. First to fly by air to Deep River Chess Club. First to promote largest international match of 18 and 19 boards. First to make transcontinental and international barnstorming tours. Played interclub matches in 5 Mexican states. 5 Canadian provinces and all 50 United States but 5 , to 1958. Visited 11 countries and flew by plane to 3 - all in 1958.
QUEEN CITY CHESS CLUB
210 Delaware Avenue, Buffalo 22
New York: Phone: TL-3-4300
Open daily 12 noon to 2 AM
NASSAU CHESS CLUB
Brierely Park Game Room, Clinton \& Dartmouth St., Hempstead, New York Meets every Wednesday evening
HUNTINGTON T'NSHIP CHESS CLUB Old Fields Inn, 81 Broadway, Greenlawn, New York: meets Thursday 8 PM Phone: AN-1-6466.
JAMAICA CHESS CLUB
155-10 Jamaica Avenue, Jamaica,
New York: open daily, afternoon
and evening. Phonet JA 6-9035.
LEVITTOWN CHESS CLUB
Levittown (N.Y.) Public Library, Bluegrass \& Shelter Lanes, Thursday evenings: phone: PE-1-3142

BRONX CENTER CHESS CLUB
Formerly Westchester-Bronx CC 3990 Hillman Av., Bronx, N. Y.
Meets Friday evenings: TA•3-0607
CHESS \& CHECKER CLUB OF N. Y. 212 W 42 St NY 36, John Fursa, Dir. Open daily afternoon \& evenings; no membership fees: public invited.
C. Y. O. CHESS CLUB

202 Van Buren Street
Brooklyn, New York 11221
Mon., Tues., Wed., 7 PM to 10 PM
LONDON TERRACE CHESS CLUB 470 W. 24 St., New York 11, N. Y. Meets Wednesday evenings
Telephone: SL-6-2083
MANHATTAN CHESS CLUB 353 West 57 St., New York 19, N, Y. Henry Hudson Hotel, near 9th Avenue Telephone: CI-5-9478

MARSHALL CHESS CLUB
23 West 10 Street
New York, New York
Telephone: GR-7-3716
ROSSOLIMO CHESS STUDIO
Sullivan and Bleecker St., New York,
New York; GR-5-9737; open daily
from 6 PM, sat. \& Sun, from 2 PM
PARKWAY CHESS CLUB
Central Park YMCA
1105 Elm Street, Cincinnati 10, Ohio
Thurs. evening \& Sunday afternoon
CHESS CENTER, Inc.
Masonic Building, 3615 Euclid
Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio
Phone: EN-1-9836
columbus "Y" chess club
40 West Long Street
Columbus, Ohio
DAYTON CHESS CLUB
at Dayton Public Library, P. O. Box 323 Dayton, Ohio 45401
7 PM, Friday evenings

## TULSA CHESS ASSOCIATION

At Whiteside Recreation Center, 608 Wright Bldg., 41st and So. Pittsburg Tulsa, Okiahoma, meets Monday evenings.

CHESSMEN OF MARPLE-NEWTOWN 8 PM Wed., at the old Broomall Library bldg., 2nd floor, Sproul and Springfield Roads, Broomall, Pennsylvania

FRANKLIN-MERCANTILE C. C. Hotel Philadelphian, Broad and Vine Streets, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania Open daily.

GERA CHESS CLUB
General Electric Company 3198 Chestnut St., Room 4443 Philadelphia, Penna. 19101

RHODE ISLAND ADULT CHESS CLUB
No. 111 Empire Street
Providence, Rhode Island


## THE NOTEBOOM MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

A tournament in which six of the eight participants possess the title of Grandmaster seems somewhat topheavy. It also induces the opinion that the result of such a small tournament, meaning that within the top-ranked participants, must depend to a high degree upon good luck. Such an opinion, however, is valid only if the competing grandmasters not only have the same title but also the same strength.

Such certainly was not the case in the Noteboom Memorial Tournament held at Noordwijk. It was not possible with Mikhail Botvinnik among the players. In the whole world, there are not six Botvinniks, and the particularly eminent merit of this former world champion was demonstrated again. There are no six Bent Larsens either; but this statement refers to style rather than strength, as is confirmed by the results of the tournament.

Botvinnik played strongly; Larsen experimented strongly. It could be expected that, in such a short tournament, Larsen would have a heavy task. Under such circumstances, bold play may lead to a convincing success but it may lead also to an outright failure.

After the Danish grandmaster had to submit to Botvinnik in the first round, any convincing success was almost certainly out of the question. On the
other hand, one cannot speak of an outright failure. Larsen scored the fewest draws of all the competitors, only one! He played dauntlessly and, apparently, considered the tournament as a welcome preparation for his forthcoming match with Boris Ivkov in the Challengers Round of the World Championship Program.

Whether Botvinnik played with the same idea of preparation, too, is dubious. It is whispered, even rather loudly, that he will not claim his right for a place in the Challengers Round, and he will not play against Smyslov, an event scheduled for the middle of April.*

Still, it is not absolutely impossible that Botvinnik has taken this tournament less seriously than most of his tournaments. His play had a light touch from time to time and, maybe, this flightiness was caused by the fact that it soon appeared he did not need ic give of his utmost to come in first.

The phenomenon is manifest in his game with Donner. For a long time, the game floats between draw and win, and the former world champion more than once overlooks his strongest continuation. As Donner drops some stitches also, in the end, it is Botvinnik who adds a new win (his fourth at the time) to his still clean score.


[^0]Now White is playing against the Panov Variation in the Caro-Kam Reversed.

| $6 \ldots$ | N-B3 |
| :--- | ---: |
| $7 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $8 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\ldots$. |

Now, however, it is the Semi-classic Variation of the Queen's Gambit in Reverse. As compensation for his isolated Pawn. Black has a free game for his minor pieces.

| $8 \ldots \ldots$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| $90-0$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| $10 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ |

Here 10 . . Q-B2 runs into 11 $\mathrm{N} / 4-\mathrm{N} 5, \mathrm{BxP}: 12 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 113 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$, B-N6 14 NxQP with a superior position for White.

| 11 B-N2 | R-K1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 12 R-B1 | B-Q2 |
| 13 B-B3 | $\cdots$ |

Botvinnik considers the interpolation of $13 \mathrm{NxN}, \mathrm{BxN}$ before $14 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$ as preferable.

| $13 \ldots \ldots$ | $N \times N$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| 14 Q×N | $B-K 4$ |
| 15 Q-Q2 | $B-N 5$ |

(See diagram, top of next page)
16 KR-Q1
This move is surprising: White permits doubling of his Pawns. Apparently, Botvinnik doesn't care to go deeply into the variation: $16 \mathrm{BxB}, \mathrm{BxP}: 17 \mathrm{KxB}$, NaBt. With a little more effort the former world champion undoubtedly

## Final Standings

| Mikhail Botvinnik |  | Bent Larsen | $31 / 2-31 / 2$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Petar Trifunovich | $41 / 2-21 / 2$ | M. Bobotsov | $3-4$ |
| Salo Flohr | $4-3$ | J. H. Donner | $3-4$ |
| H. B. van den Berg | $31 / 2-31 / 2$ | J. Kort | 61/2-1/2 |



Position after 15 . . B-N5
would see that, after $18 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 3$, White has nothing to lear.
$16 \ldots$
$\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$
$17 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$
. . .

Such damage to the King position is always a handicap.

| $17 \ldots \mathrm{~K} 2$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 18 N 2 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B4} 4$ |
| Here perhaps $18 \ldots$ | QR-B1 is better. |
| $19 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | BXB |
| $20 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |
| $21 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 4$ |

Protection of the base of the open Queen Bishop file (Black's QB1) is of vital importance. So Black ought to have played 21 . . . Q-Q2.

22 R-B2!


By simple (but instructive) means, White now secures control of the open Queen Bishop file.
$22 \ldots$
N-Q2
If Black had played his Queen to Q2. he could now continue comfortably with $22 \ldots$. RxR 23 QxR, R-QB1.

23 R/1-B1
R-N1
Actually, exchanging is the lesser evil.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
24 \text { Q-B3 } & \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 1 \\
25 \text { Q-B7 } & \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3
\end{array}
$$

Exchanging at this point, however, facilitates White's task.

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
26 \text { Q-N3 } & \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 3 \\
27 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{N} & \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{N}
\end{array}
$$

Now Black's Queen Pawn is "de-isolated." But there are new dangers for Black on the seventh rank.

## 28 R-B7

Primarily, White's threat is $29 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 7$ followed by deadly doubling of Rooks on the seventh rank.

$$
28 \ldots \quad \text { KR-Q1 }
$$

(See diagram, top of next column)

## 29 P-KR4

Here, also, Botvinnik offers something of a surprise.


Position after 28 KR.Q1
White has a clear win by 29 P-B4! The following example is typical: $29 \ldots$ $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 530 \mathrm{R} / 1-\mathrm{B} 5$, and $30 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$ (to prevent 31 R-KN5) $31 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 5$ with the threat of 32 RxKP! or 30 . . . P-Q6 31 R-KN5, P-KN3 32 Q-R3, and Black must resign.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 29 \ldots \\
& 30 \text { R/1-B5 }
\end{aligned}
$$

P-K4
30 Q-N5 leads to a favorable ending.

| $30 \ldots$ P-R3 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 31 P-R5 | R-Q3 |

Now that Black prevents the penetration of White's Queen to N6, the chances are about even.

## Solutions to ANNOUNCE THE MATE!

No. 1 White mates with $1 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7 \mathrm{f}$ ! NxR [or 1 . . . K-R1 2 Q-B2 with much the same kind of mate or $2 \ldots$. N-N5 3 $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 6 \dagger$, NxQ $4 \mathrm{PxN}, \mathrm{QxP} \mathrm{\dagger} \dagger 5 \mathrm{NxQ}$, any 6 RxP $\dagger$ or $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 7$ 万, $\mathrm{NxR} 7 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 7$ mate] 2 $\mathrm{RxN} \dagger$, K-R1 [or 2 . . . K-R3 3 Q-N4 etc.] 3 Q-B2, Q-Q1 4 Q-B6t, QxQ 5 PxQ, any 6 RxP $\dagger$ or $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 7 \dagger$. NxR $7 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 7$. No. 2 Black mates after 1 . . . R-BS $\dagger$ ! 2 RxR [or $2 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2$, B-N4 $\dagger$ etc. or 2 $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 2 . \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 5 \dagger$ etc.], B-N5 $\ddagger 3 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1$, Q-B5 $\dagger$.
No. 3 White mates after 1 K-R1! R-Q! [as good as any: 1 . . P-KR4 allows $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 4 \dagger$ with mate to follow] $2 \mathrm{BxP} \dagger$ : $\mathrm{KxB} 3 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4 \stackrel{\dagger}{4}, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 24 \mathrm{QxP} 4, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 35$ Q-R4 $\dagger, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 36 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 1+$.
No. 4 Black mates by 1 . . . N-N $6 \dagger$ [or 1 ... NxBt first] 2 RPxN [or 2 BPxN . B-N5 mate], NxB $\dagger 3$ PxN, Q-K5.
No. 5 White mates after $1 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 7 \dagger \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ $2 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 4 \mathrm{~s}$. K-N1 $3 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 7 \dagger$, K-B1 4 BxB ! No. 6 Black mates after 1 . . . Q-B7\% $2 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 3, \mathrm{QxP} \dagger$ ! $3 \mathrm{KxQ}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 3 \dagger$ and 4 $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 3, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 7 \dagger$ and 5 . . B-Q3 $\dagger$ or 4 $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 2, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3 \dagger$ etc.
No. 7 White mates after 1 QxP $\ddagger$ ! $K x Q$ 2 N-N5 $\dagger, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 3$ [else $3 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 6$ mate] 3 P-K5广. KxP [else 4 N/2-K4 mate] 4 $\mathrm{N} / 2-\mathrm{B} 3 \div$. K-B3 5 N-K4t, K-B2 6 $\mathrm{N} / 3-\mathrm{N} 5 \dagger$.
No. 8 Black mates after 1... Q-B6 $2 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 7 \grave{\ddagger}$ ! $3 \mathrm{RxQ}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 6 \dagger 4 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$, PxRt.
No. 9 White mates after $1 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{RS} \uparrow$ ! NxR $2 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 7 \dagger$ ! KxB $3 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 1 \dagger, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 34 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 4 \div$. No. 10 Black mates after $1 . . . Q-Q 7 \dagger$ ! $2 \mathrm{BxQ}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 6 \ddagger 3 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 1, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 7 \dagger 4 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1$. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 8 \mathrm{t}$.

## 32 Q-N4

 33 PxPP-Q5!

$$
R \times P
$$

Not 33 R-KB5!

33 Q-N3
R-B5
Now White's activity is virtually paralyzed.
35 R-B
R-KB1
37 Q-N4
P-QN3
$36 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} \quad \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R} \quad 38 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 7$


38
R-B2?
Now Donner takes his turn. After 38 . K-R2, he need no longer lose.
Surprisingly, the Queen ending gives White good chances despite the insecure position of his King.

| 39 | $R \times R$ | $K \times R$ | 41 Q-B8 $\dagger$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 40 | Q-Q $7 \dagger$ | $K-R 2$ |  |
| $K-N 1$ | $42 Q \times P$ | $\ldots$. |  |

White has cashed in his Pawn. Now Black takes a hand.

| $42 \ldots$ | Q-N4 $\dagger$ | 44 | Q-Q3 $\dagger$ | $K-N 1$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 43 K-B1 | QxP | 45 | $P-R 4!$ | $\ldots$. |

In Queen endings, the most outside passed Pawn is always of great importance. White sets out to obtain such a Pawn in the quickest way.


When both sides do the same thing, it is yet not the same. Black's King-side passed Pawn is not so strong as his opposite number on the other side of the board, not by far.
47 Q-Q5 $\dagger$
K-R2
48 Q-Q1 Q-R7

Now, bowever, quite another, and almost unbelievable, factor is added. is ... Q-R6 leaves some drawing chances at least. But Black is heading to stalemate his Queen!
49 P-N4
P-R5
50 Q-KB1

White completes the stalemate.

| 50 | P-KN4 | 52 | PxP | P-N5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 51 P-R5 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | 53 | P-R6 | Resigns | cause is hopeless.

## A THRICE TOLD TALE

## The Bronstein Brilliancy of the 1964 U. S. S. R. Championship As Annotated by DR. MAX EUWE, HANS KMOCH and World Champion TIGRAN PETROSYAN

With perverse logic, a real brilliancy can become an "editor's headache." For all annotators rush to comment upon it.
So it was with Bronstein's brilliancy. It came for our regular "Game of the Month" by former world champion Dr. Max Euce. And we had to put it by as Hans Kmoch had already annotated it for us (March issue, page 95). When it came also in a piece by W orld Champion Tigran Petrosyan, that was too much! Comments by both Euwe and Petrosyan
are too valuable to discard. Then it occurred to us that readers have often requested "comparative analyses." So we resuscitated the game and Kmoch's notes, to merge with Euwe's and Petrosyan's commentaries.

The results seems somewhat disappointing. For these eminent annotators each worked against a fast deadline and, prob. ably, for different grades of readers. Hence, comparisons may be unjair. Still, if the idea appeals, let us know.-ED.

## Authors are indicated by ME for Euwe, HK for Kmoch and TP for Petrosyan

Honor is due to Bronstein for having played the most beautiful game in the tournament. This game, in which Bronstein after deploying dynamically soon masters the initiative, is crowned by a number of splendid sacrifices which tell their own story. ME

In this game, Black chooses a somewhat dubious variation. It requires sharp counterplay, however, whereas White proceeds peacefully. An ill-considered Pawn move then deprives White of any chance to open lines for counterplay and so seals his fate. Obtaining all the attack, Black presses it home wiith an ultra-attractive finish. HK

The writer believes that the game analyzed below, between Moscow Champion Nikolai Bakulin, a Master and newcomer in the Soviet national title tournament, and Grandmaster David Bronstein, also from Moscow, will be of great interest to chess fans. TP

## CARO-KANN DEFENSE


but at the same time less safe. ME

$$
5 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{N} \dagger
$$

Black has a choice of capturing his rival's Knight with his King Pawn. But that continuation will please White very much because, depending on the circumstances and even his mood, he can select in the middle game a sharp plan linked with castling in different directions or else try to take advantage of a better position with an extra Pawn on the Queenside. TP

$$
5 \ldots \quad N P \times N
$$

With 5... KPxN, Black accepts a clear minority which-as experience has taught-yet appears to give tactical chances. ME

Nimzovich often used to play this variation, and later Flohr, and quite successfully until it "got worn out" (as Flohr put it after running into a losing
position against Bernstein at Groningen 1946). Today, the variation is rarely adopted. HK

Bronstein is one of those few players who for many years have been employing this move, which leads to sharp play from the outset. TP


## 6 B-K3

Preferable perhaps is 6 P-QB3 or 6 $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 2$. The Queen Bishop often does better work on its B4. ME

As Black needs to get in . . . B-KB4 before . . . P-K3, White's recommended continuation is $6 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 47 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3$, B-N3 8 P-KR4 (Horowitz-Flohr, USSRUSA Radio Match 1945). At any rate, White ought to operate with the possibilities of P-KR5 or P-KB5. Bakulin's continuation is harmless. HK

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
6 \ldots & B-B 4 \\
7 Q-Q 2 & \ldots
\end{array}
$$

In Bronstein-Matanovich, Hastings $1953-4$, White played $7 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 2$ and $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 3$, which comes to about the same thing. ME


This last move does not look very convincing as White cannot stop the advance of Black's King Rook Pawn any more. ME

[^1]$11 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ is more consistent and safer, too, now. HK
White has been playing inconsistently right from the start. Having first prepared for castling on the Queenside, he changes his mind later and hides his King on the opposite side. The typical plan for Black in this opening is to use the King Knight file to build up an attack on the Kingside. By transferring his Knight to KN3, instead of a more natural development of this piece to KB3, White only helps his opponent carry out his scheme. If this game would have proceeded in a more tranquil manner, White's error would probably pass unnoticed. But, in the mutually sharp position which has shaped up on the board, it proves to be fraught with consequence. TP

11
P-KR4!


12 KR-Q1
White ought to play $12 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ in order to strengthen his KB4 by N-K2. It is clear 12 P-KR4 doesn't merit recommendation on account of $12 \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q3}$ : e.g. 13 N-R1?? B-R7 mate!. ME

| $12 \ldots$ N-B1 | P-R5 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 13 P-R6 |  |
| 14 P-KN3 | O-O-O |

Both sides play for attack on the enemy King position. But it is Black alone who has made any progress. HK 15 P-QB4

P-QB4
The last is a courageous move. Black allows his opponent a protected, passed Pawn in the center with the idea of closing the center and thus improving the attacking possibilities on the wing. After 15 . . N-B4 16 P-QN4, N-K5 17 Q-N2, White's position is excellent. ME

When attacking on the flank, one ought not forget the middle. That is why Bronstein preliminarily wants to ascertain relations there. TP

$$
16 \text { P-Q5 }
$$

Here is the ill-considered move. It blocks the center, whereas the possi-

[^2]bility of QPxBP ought to be kept open. Moreover, White ought to remove his Queen from the fire of the opposing Rook. 16 Q-K1 accomplishes both aims and may be followed, in due time, by Q-B1. On 16 . . PxP 17 BxP, P-K4, he can avoid the speculative 18 BxRP, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3$ by playing $19 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{QB} 3$. HK
16.

P-K4


Black has the superior chances for attack, largely because of the local Pawn majority on the King and King Bishon files. HK

The position in the middle has become stabilized. White's passed Pawn on Q5 is reliably blocked and spells no danger whatsoever for Black, It is not an exaggeration to say that, at this early stage when it seems as though the whole fight lies ahead, the fate of the game has been predetermined strategically. Black will advance his King and King Bishop Pawns to the fifth rank, after which the protection of the White King will be weak. The Black pieces will be more active when the diagonals are opened for operations by the Bishops together with the use of the King and King Knight files. The Black Pawn on KR6 will play an obviously vital role. TP

## 17 QR-B1

17 P-QN4 immediately leads, after 17 $\ldots$ PxP 18 P-B5, to vivid complications with an uncertain outcome. ME

17 P-Q6, Q-B3 sets up a mating threat which must be parried. $18 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ is countered very strongly by 18 $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$. And $18 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 5, \mathrm{QxQ} 19 \mathrm{RxQ}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3$ leaves White's artificially isolated Queen Pawn hopelessly weak, as does 18 P-B3. HK

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
17 \ldots & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B4} 4 \\
18 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 4 & \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3
\end{array}
$$

Now 18 . . . PxP is bad on account of $19 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{NxP}$ ? $20 \mathrm{BxN}, \mathrm{BxB} 21 \mathrm{RxB}$ : ME

Black's last is a highly instructive move. There is no sense in seeking an advantage in such variants as the following type: $18 \ldots$ PxP 19 P-Q6, Q-B3 $20 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 3, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 421 \mathrm{QxP}, \mathrm{RxP} 22 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ in which the White pieces spring to life. The issue of the game will be decided on the Kingside. TP

## 19 P-B3

White ought not permit the advance of Black's King Bishop Pawn. 19 P-B4 is correct. ME

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
19 \ldots & \text { P-B5 } \\
20 \text { B-B2 } & \text { QR-K1 }
\end{array}
$$



DAVID BRONSTEIN
Black prepares for . . . P-K5. ME 21 K-R1
The King does not stand well on KN1. but it is probably worse off in the corner. ME

| $21 \ldots$ R-K1 | $K R-N 1$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| 22 P-K5! |  |



Already the decision. The threat of . P-K6 forces White to simplify on his QB5 thus conceding an important diagonal to his opponent. ME
Black's attack virtually plays itself. HK
The White King's haven is engulfed in flames. $T P$
23 BxP
$\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{B}$
24 PxN
QxP

With the tremendous threat, $25 \ldots$ Q-B7. ME
Now Black threatens $25 \ldots$ Q-B7. HK

$$
25 \text { B-Q1 B-B2 }
$$

The threat of $26 \ldots$ B-N3 now forces White to a new concession. ME
And now he threatens $26 \ldots$ B-N3. HK
The end is drawing near. There is the threat of $26 \ldots$ B-N3 with a further threat of . . Q-N8 mate. TP 26 NPXP
White aims to meet $26 \ldots$ B-N3 with $27 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3$. HK


Now Black uses his advantage brilliantly and wins by force. White has against $26 \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{QR} 4$ the expedient of 27 Q-K3. HK

## 27 Q-K2

Not 27 RxP, RxR 28 QxR, QxQ 29 NxQ, BxP $30 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ etc. ME

The alternatives are no better: 1) 27 NxP, B-QR4; 2) 27 Q-QN2, B-QR4 28 $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ etc. 3) 27 RxP, RxR and 28 QxR, QxQ 29 NxQ, BxP $30 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3$, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ ! etc. or $28 \mathrm{NxR}, \mathrm{BxP} 29 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3$, R-K1 etc. HK

A prosaic variant is possible after 27 RxP, $27 \ldots$ RxR 28 QxR, QxQ 29 NxQ , $\mathrm{BxP} 30 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 131 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{RxR}$ or 31 N-B2, BxN, while it suffices to answer 27 NxP by $27 \ldots \mathrm{BxP} 28 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3$, R-K4 with irresistible threats. TP

$$
27 \ldots \quad B-Q 6!
$$

In order to re-open the diagonal, QB4-KN8 for Black. This factor is worth a piece. ME

There are other good moves here: e.g. 27 . . . B-QR4; but Bronstein's continuation is most powerful and beautiful. HK
As in his youthful chess-playing days, Bronstein does not miss a chance to complete a game in elegant style. TP $28 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$
$\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 8+$ !


A charming conclusion. ME 29 KxR P-K7S
For the sake of moving this Pawn, which cleared the way for the Queena winning reply to $30 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Rl}$ is $30 \ldots$. Q-B7-Black sacrificed two pieces. TP $30 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 3$
If $30 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$, Black has $30 \ldots$ Q-B7 31 Q-B5t, K-N1 32 QxRP, R-N1! etc. ME
On $30 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 7$, White cannot prevent mate. HK

| 30 ... | $R \times N$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| 31 Q-B5 $\dagger$ | $R-K 3 \S!$ |

The crowning point. HK

```
32 K-R1
Q-B7 Resigns
```

This brilliant game by Bronstein serves as a model illustrating the need of having a clear plan from the very begimning in mobilizing the pieces, and on this basis planning middle-game play. TP

## IT'S YOUR MOVE!

Remember! Give us six weeks notice of change of address. Copies do not get forwarded and also can take weeks onroute. So we must have notice early!


## END-GAME STUDY 47

From the Interzonal Tournament at Amsterdam 1964.
B. Berger - Australia

L. Lengyel - Hungary

This interesting position was thoroughly analyzed by Lengyel

Lengyel
Berger
White Black

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
57 \ldots & R-N 8 \\
58 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 4 & \mathrm{P}
\end{array}
$$

On $58 \ldots$ R-QB8, proposed by Benko, White wins, according to Florian, with $59 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 5$ !

| 59 | R-B2 $\dagger$ | K-N2 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 60 | P-Q7 | R-K8 $\dagger$ |
| 61 K-B3 | Resigns |  |

Now for the analysis, which is divided into four main variations.

## Variation I.

Black tries to support the Rook Pawn with the Knight Pawn.
(Continue from first diagram)

$$
\begin{array}{lllll}
57 \ldots & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 4 & 59 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7 \dagger & \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 3 \\
58 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2 \dagger & \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 2 & 60 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 7 \dagger & \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 4 \\
& & 61 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 7 & \ldots .
\end{array}
$$

(See diagram, top of next column)

$$
61 \ldots \quad R-N 8
$$

On $61 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 7$, White has $62 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7 \div$ : as $62 \ldots \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 3$ fails against $63 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 8$ (N) mate! This mighty minor piece promotion is one of White's important, winning finesses.

Black has to play $62 \ldots \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 3$, and then White stops the Rook Pawn with 63 R-Bl. Thereafter; White's Pawns de-
and his second, Chessmaster Florian. The game had just been adjourned for the second time, and White's sealed move was $57 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 4$.

On the basis of White's far advanced and central Pawns, he has considerably the better game. Yet the win is not so simple and, in several variations, possible only by means of problem-type moves.

Master Florian has been so kind as to supply the secrets of this endgame.

First, however, let us look at the finish of the game as actually played upon resumption.**


Position after 61 P-Q7
cide easily: e.g. 63 , . . R-N7 $64 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 2$, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 6 \dagger 65 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 7 \dagger 66 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 3, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 7$ 67 P-K6, P-R8(Q) 68 RxQ. K-B3 69 $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 8, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 770 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 8 \dagger$ etc.

| 62 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7 \dagger$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 63 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 6 \dagger$ | $\mathrm{~K} \dagger \mathrm{~N} 2$ |
| 64 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 5!$ | $\cdots$. |

White's King steps out from the cherk by the queening Rook Pawn and also avoids $64 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 8(\mathrm{Q}), \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} \%$.
On $64 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 765 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QR} 6, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 8$ $66 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 6, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$, Black actually can draw.
$64 \ldots \quad$ R-Q8 66 PxR P-R7 65 R-Q6! R $\times$ R 67 P-Q8(Q)

P-R8(Q)

[^3]

This Queen ending is easily won by White because of his far advanced Pawn: e.g. 68 Q-B7ヶ, K-N3 69 P-Q7. Black has only a few, insignificant checks.

## Variation II.

Blach tries to protect the Rook Pawn with the Rook from the flank. In this, as in the previous variation, Black's Rook must also attempt to prevent the advance of White's Pawns from behind.
(Continue from first diagram)

| $57 \ldots$ | R-N6 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 58 | R-B2 $\dagger$ | K-Q2 |
| 59 | R-B7 $\dagger$ | K-K3 |

59 . . . K-K1 or K-Q1 loses directly due to $60 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 6$.

| 60 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 7 \dagger$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 61 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7 \dagger$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 3$ |

Here $61 \ldots$ K-K3 cannot be played because of 62 P-Q7! e.g. $62 \ldots$ KxR 63 $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 8(\mathrm{Q}), \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 764 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 7 \div$, and $64 \ldots$ $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 365 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2 \div$ etc. or $64 \ldots \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 365$ Q-B4t, K-K2 66 Q-R4 etc. or $61 \ldots$ K-K1 65 Q-R5, R-N7 $66 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 5$. Or $62 \ldots$ P-R7 63 P-Qs(N) mate!


62 R-B1
This is a typical maneuver. After separating Black's King from White's
$\div=$ check $\ddagger \ddagger=$ dbl, check; $\S=$ dis. ch.

Pawns, the Rook retreats to stop the Black Pawns. [After 62 P-Q7, P-R7, Black queens with check or meets 63 R-B1 with $63 \ldots$ R-N8.]

| 62 |  | P-R7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 63 | R-QR1 | R-N7 |
| 64 | K-B3 |  |
| P-K6 also is good. |  |  |
| 64 | . . . | R-R7 |
| 65 | P-K6 | K-B3 |
| 66 | P-K7 | R-R1 |

If $66 \ldots \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$, white has $67 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1 \dagger$ etc.

| $67 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 68 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| $69 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B4} 4$ |  |  |

Plainly, White can win: e.g, $69 \ldots$ R-R4 $70 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 5, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 4 \div 71 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 5$ etc.

## Variation III.

Black tries to let his Rook Pawn advance with the Rook behind it, after 57 $\ldots R-N 5 \dagger$ and $\ldots R-N 1$ and $\ldots R-Q R 1$.

## (Continue from first diagram)

```
57 . . .
\(\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 5+\)
58 K-K3!
```

On 58 K-B3, Black draws by $58 \ldots$ $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 5$ ! Black had this chance just before adjournment in the actual game but, in mutual time trouble, failed to take advantage of White's inaccuracy.


58
R-N1
Other moves pose few problems for the White side:

1) $58 \ldots \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 459 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 7, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 160 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 8$ (Q) $\dagger, \mathrm{RxQ} 61 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 2 \dagger, \mathrm{KxP} 62 \mathrm{RxR}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N}$ $63 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 3$, and White wins comfortably;
2) $58 \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 259 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2 \dagger, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 360$ P-K6!
3) $58 \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QR} 559 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2 \uparrow$, K-Q2 60 $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7 \uparrow$, K-K3 $61 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 7$ ! , K-B4 $62 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 7$, and $62 \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 163 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 8$ ! and White wins or $62 \ldots$ P-R7 63 P-Q8(Q). P-R8(Q) $64 \quad$ Q-B8t and white soon mates:
4) $58 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 459 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2 \dagger$, and
a) $59 \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 560 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ ! $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 261$ $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 6 \dagger, \mathrm{KxP} 62 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 7, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 763 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 8(\mathrm{Q})$, P-R8(Q) 64 Q-K8 $\%$, and mate follows:
b) $59 \ldots \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 260 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7 \mathrm{t}$, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 361$ $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 7 \dagger$, K-B4 $62 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 7, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 163 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 8$, P-R7 $64 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 8(\mathrm{Q}), \mathrm{RxR} 65 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 6 \div, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 5$ $66 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 4+$, and $66 \ldots \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 667 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$, and mate follows [67 . . R-KB1!? 68 QxR, P-RS(Q) 69 Q-R6 mate] or $66 \ldots \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 4$ $67 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 2 \uparrow$ and 68 QxP , and white can win;
5) $58 \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 6 \div 59 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 4$, and
a) $59 \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 660 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 8$ [to
prevent $61 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 2161 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 2$ and Black cannot long prevent RxP:
b) $59 \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 660 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2 \dagger, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 361$ P-Q7, R-Q6 62 P-K6, and White wins:
c) $59 \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 160 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 4$ ! transposing into the text.

$$
59 \text { K-K4! }
$$

Black must not be permitted . . . K-Q4. On $59 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2 \dagger, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 460 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 7$, there follows $60 \ldots$ R-Q1! [not 60 . . . KxP due to $61 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 8$ ].

$$
59 \text {. . . . }
$$

R-QR1
On 59 … R-N5 $\dagger$, White wins after 60 K-B5. For 59 . . . P-N4, see Var. IV.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
60 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2 \dagger & \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 2 \\
61 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7 \dagger & \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 1
\end{array}
$$

On $61 \ldots$ K-Q1 62 P-K6, P-R7 63 R-KN7, the threat of mate on the back rank is decisive.

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
62 & \text { P-K6 } & \text { P-R7 } \\
63 & \text { R-KN7 } & \ldots .
\end{array}
$$

Not 63 R-KR7 as 63 . . . P-R8(Q) stops $64 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 8_{1}$. The text line may come about also by $63 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 7 \frac{1}{1}, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B1}$ [63 . .. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q1}$ loses to $64 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KN} 7] 64 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7$ t, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Nl}[64 \ldots \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Ki} 1$ loses to $65 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Qi} \dagger$, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 166 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B}+\dagger$ ] $65 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$.

| $63 \ldots$ | $K-B 1$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $64 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7 \dagger$ | $\mathrm{~K} \dagger$ |
| $65 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | $\ldots$. |



Now Black is powerless against the White Pawns: e.g. 65 . . . P-R8(Q) 66 RxQ, RxR 67 P-Q7! R-K8 68 K-B5! $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 8 \div 69 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 4$ etc.

## Variation IV.

Black attempts to let his Pawns advance together, after $57 \ldots R-N 5 \dagger$ and . . P-N4.
(Continue from first diagram)

| 57. | R-N $5 \dagger$ | 59 | K-K4 | P-N4 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 58 | K-K3 | R-N1 | 60 | R-B2 $\dagger$ |


"I do NOT take the game seriously!"
$60 \ldots \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 3$ is weak because of 61 P-K6, P-N5 62 P-K7, P-N6 63 P-Q7, PxR $64 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QS}(\mathrm{Q})$ ث. The check hurts.


## 61 R-B7 $\dagger$

Now 61 P-K6, P-N5 62 P-K7 fails: e.g., $62 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 663 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7 \dagger[63 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3$, P-N7], K-R3! [even now not 63 . . . K-N3 because of $64 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 7$. P-N7 $65 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q}(\mathrm{Q})$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 8(\mathrm{Q})+66 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2 \mathrm{~S}!] 64 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 6 \dagger$. K-R2! [64 . . K-N2 or K-N4 loses to $65 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 6+$ ! as White queens with check subsequent to 65 . . KxR], but now Black draws: $65 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 6$ ? P-R7 or $65 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7 \uparrow$, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 3$.

$$
61 \ldots \quad K-R 3
$$

61... K-N3 again allows $62 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 6$ : e.g. 62 . . . P-R7 63 R-B1, P-N5 64 P-K7, P-N6 65 P-Q7, P-N7 66 P-Q8(Q) $亠$. 62 P-Q7
Now White threatens $63 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 8$, and Black can counter only by advancing his Rook Pawn. As a result, however, the Black Pawns are separated and become vulnerable.


White's King comes up just in time to stop Black's Pawns: e,g.

1) $64 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 665 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$, and white mops up Black's Pawns while his own stand safe and will secure the win;
2) $64 \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 6 \dagger 65 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ ! [not 65 $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 6 \dot{\dagger}$ ! ], R-N1 $66 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 4$, and White wins:
3) $64 \ldots \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 265 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 6, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 666$ $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 267 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 2$ s! [here Black's last chance for a draw comes in with 67 $\mathrm{K} x \mathrm{P}$ s. K-Q3 $68 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 8(\mathrm{Q}) \mathrm{J}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ $68 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 8$, and White wins.

A very thrilling endgame. It shows again the amount of work sometimes necessary to analyze adjourned games. In comparison with the final moves of the actual game, the analysis displays a wealth of possibilities which few might suspect from simply playing over those final moves.

## By WALTER KORN



## THE TAIL END OF THE GAME



Walter Korn

La Fin de Partie was the title of Andre Cheron's voluminous book on the ending, published at Lille in 1952 and still continuing is triumphant march across the chess world. In 1955, it appeared in three volumes in a very successful German translation, and an English translation is now in the works in London.

Although books on the endgame are treated with skepticism by publishers, they are undoubtedly a most profitable proposition for long-term selling.' The latter fact is borne out by the steady sale of Reuben Fine's Basic Chess Endings, an immense and most utilitarian compilation of most of the practical aspects of end-game technique (now in paper back edition).

The scholarly mathematician Cheron, however, is more than merely practical and basic. He formulates important general rules which help toward definite understanding of typical and difficult stratagems; ${ }^{2}$ beyond the "basic," he reaches into the exceptional and intriguing field of end-game artistry; he is himself a fertile and imaginative composer who enriches old tradition with new conceptions of his own; he has exposed, through painstakingly erudite, gallically logical research, flaws in many a famed and long-established ending or study; and he often offers a revised version of the criticized piece. Thus, he is not merely a compiler but also an enjoyable and fascinating creator.

## Striving for Perfection

The writer recently visited Andre Cheron at his home at Leysin, perched high on one of Switzerland's grandiose mountains near Montreux. He showed a study invented by the well-known composer Isenegger. ${ }^{3}$

Samuel Iseneger (Basle)
Honorable Mention, Chess 1943-4


White to move and draw
The solution-which the reader will enjoy better if he finds or even just tries to find it for himself first-runs to two intended variations.

It is not too difficult to find the drawing stalemate after $1 . \ldots \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 3$ i.e.

Variation $A$

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
1 & \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3 \div & \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 3 \\
2 & \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 4 & \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 7
\end{array}
$$

After 2 . . . P-N8(Q) 3 R-N4t etc., Black can no longer mate. Nor after other moves permitting $3 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 4 \div$ and 4 R×P.
$3 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{N}$
$P-N 8(Q)$
4 R-N2 $\dagger$
$Q \times R$ Stalemate

In the second, critical, variation, the draw is arrived at after a prolonged Rook versus Knight duel, and with the stalemate on a rank one higher than in the previous variation.
Variation B

| 1 | $R-B 3 \dagger$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | 5 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3!$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{R} 4!$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 2 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 7$ | 6 | $\mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 8(\mathrm{Q})$ |
| 3 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3!$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 5!$ | 7 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 3 \dagger!$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$ |
| 4 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 4!$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3!$ |  | Stalemate |  |

With uncanny instinct, Cheron detected that this study can be subjected to a subtle, yet technically considerable improvement. He demonstrated his paraphrase in the Courrier de Leysin, May 8, 1962.
$t=$ check; $\ddagger=$ dbl. check; $\S=$ dis. ch.


## White to move and draw

As will be seen, the switch of the Black King to KB2 adds a significant third variation and serves to make the three clearly identifiable. And the aesthetics of the setting are enhanced by the closing in of the more remote Knight: the solver must feel in his finger tips White's task has become more difficult with Black's force more menacing nearer on Q1 instead of QB2. Let's view the whole show:

## 1 R-B3 $\dagger$

Now three, Instead of two, echo variations unfold.

Variation $A$

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
1 \ldots & \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 3 \\
2 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 4 &
\end{array}
$$

Not $2 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 8$ as 2 . . $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 2$ wins,
$2 \ldots \quad \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 7$

And Stalemate follows as in the Isenegger study.

Variation B

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
1 \ldots \mathrm{R} 4! & \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 2 \\
2 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 4! & \cdots
\end{array}
$$

Here $2 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 5$ loses to 2 . . N-K3; but the text draws as per Isenegger.

Variation C
1...
$\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 1$

Here is the added possibility, vaguely existent in an inaccurate sideline of the original Isenegger study, but clear and independent in Cheron's.

[^4]As before, 2 R-B5 loses to 2 . . $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 3$.
2
$\begin{array}{llll} & \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3 & \mathrm{~N} 7 & \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 4! \\ \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 5 & 5 & \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2! & \mathrm{KB} 3\end{array}$

Not $5 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 4$ ! as Black wins: 6 $\mathrm{KxN}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 8(\mathrm{Q})$ or $6 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 3$.
5 . . . 2
P-N8(Q)
Stalemate
Q×R

## Critical Review

The foregoing piece is not included in Cheron's book as it is an artistic extreme which happens not to fit in with any of the instructive chapters. Here, however, the writer proceeds, but with tongue in cheek, to give a few which are in his book-to serve, perhaps, as a critical review of Cheron's book.

Andre Cheron (1945)


Whoever moves: Black wins
This study is still included in the recent second edition although the precision of the solution was long ago discredited. Just consider the part in which Black moves first.

## Variation A

$\begin{array}{lrll}1 . \ldots & \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 6! & 3 & \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 5 \\ 2 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2 \dagger & \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 7 & 4 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P} & \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 7 \dagger \\ \end{array}$
Black secures control over the black squares and wins: e.g. $5 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 5, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6$ !

Cheron explains that this line $A$ is the only correct one for Black as other moves are wrong.

But consider one other variation.
Variation B

| $1 \because \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | $K-Q 5$ |
| :--- | :--- |

Now Cheron points out that 2 $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 4$ and 2 . . . P-B6t fail; but he misses the following.

$$
2 \ldots \quad K-K 6
$$

For now, if $3 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q}+4 \mathrm{BxP}+$, Black has 4 . . . K-(26 with the same result as in Variation A. So the ending is inexact with a second possible solution, not just a transposition either but the gain of a tempo by a different sequence. This inexactitude was pointed out in Caissa (1950) by A. Fanderl and repeated in L'Echiquier de Paris (1951).

Another study left uncorrected in Cheron's 1964 edition is Havel's miniature mentioned in this column (page 298. October 1962). Havel's original solution as given in CHESS REVIEW
contains three echoes of thrilling immensity. But all end-game books, includIng Cheron's, still give only two variations or quote the third, if at all, incorrectly. Actually, this is a very rare slip of Cheron's who has eliminated quite a few studies as faulty and mentions them in his foreword to the second edition. Unfortunately, he does not specify the faulss: but he told the writer he has found, in fact, at least twenty-five per cent of the famed Troitaky's studies defective. And, as he does not give details of his own laborious findings, the Russians seem to have been reluctant also to publish any omnibus edition of Troitzky's work (or, for that matter, of Kubbel's or of the Platovs') lest, perhaps. it will be debunked by Cheron. Neither do they want officially to publish the Frenchman's dethroning of their heroes, But Cheron won't tell without public recognition!

Cheron does not abide formalistically on the priority of appearance of a theme and does not even refer to any forerunners if and when the artistic merits of a later piece suit his purpose of exposition better, A point in case is his description of the draw with Rook Pawn "supported" by a Bishop of the wrong color, and the few rare exceptions to this near axiom. Berger's Theory and Practice of the Endgame (2 edition, 1921) selects a "basic" position composed by "A. Z." for the London Chess Chronicle (page 224,1860 ).


White to move and win
The win is of course obvious (but try it!) after White's second move, but the idea of the protective wall by $B / R 7$ and $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{R} 6$ is well devised.


[^5]$$
1 \text { P-R6! }
$$

If 1 . . . K-B3, White has $2 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 4$ or even $2 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 4$.

| $2 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 7!$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | 4 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 5$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $3 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $5 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 6$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |
|  |  | $6 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 7$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 1$ |

And white wins.
Cheron ignores this first presentation, however, and chooses instead an adaptation by Troitzky, dated 1896, which a dogmatic judge might superficially call an "anticipation." But such a label would ignore Troitzky's transformation of a didactic ending into an artistic model.


Comparison of the two positions discloses, as a first finesse, that Troitzky's positioning of White's Bishop on KR3 helps considerably to conceal the winning technique. In the starting position (in the last diagram), the Bishop does not command the crucial diagonal, QN1KR7, and is instead completely out of range and seemingly out of any focus while on the diagonal, KR3-QB8. That the Bishop has to be re-aligned becomes the first part of the solution and so the position is somewhat less obvious than that of 1860 .

The second important finesse is that White has to interpolate a move by the Bishop to cut off too rapid an advance by Black's King. This need serves further to conceal the final, vital positioning of the Bishop on the QN1-KR7 diagonal and so increases the solver's task which is no longer just to find the crucial second move.

## 1 B-K6!

In other words, on $1 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 7$ ! White lacks time to build his protective wall with $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R} 7$ and $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 6$.

| 1. | $K-K 2$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| 2 P-R $6!$ | $K-B 3!$ |
| 3 | $B-B 5!$ |

Thus, White's Bishop secures the proper diagonal, and with a sacrificial offer, to boot.

| $3 . \ldots$. | $K-B 2$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 4 B-R7! | $K-B 3$ |
| 5 K-B4 |  |

Now White finishes as in the previous position. But the Troitzky version has one more artistic virtue as appears here. Troitzky's King, placed on K3. does not have the dual possibility of $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B4}$ and $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 4$. Moreover, as it is further from the scene of action, White's apparent difficulty of winning is increased.
(Concluded on page 154)

## 1964 OLYMPIAD

# SELECTED GAMES Annotated by Hans Kmoch 

## Magical Finish

In this game, White treats the opening passively, then starts trying to repair the damage with three successive combinations, each impressive but not forcing enough. Black skilfully repels all onslaughts and wins the almost even finish as if by magic.

## OLD INDIAN DEFENSE

Yair Kraidman
Lothar Schmid
Israel
West Germany
White
Black

| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q4}$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB3}$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB4}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q3}$ |
| $3 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ |
| A rarely adopted line | - most likely |
| just barely playable. |  | just barely playable.

4 PxP
$\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} \quad 6 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$
KN-Q2
$5 \mathrm{QxQ} \dagger$
$\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{Q} \quad 7 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$

This is a very tame treatment.
Most dangerous for Black in positions of this sort is an attack starting with P-KB4. So $7 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KN} 5$, K-K1 8 P-B4 deserves consideration.

A promising continuation is $7 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KN} 3$ (e.g. Najdorf-Boleslavsky, Groningen 1946).
$\begin{array}{lrrrr}7 \ldots & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 3 & 9 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} & \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 2 \\ 8 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3 & 10 & \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4\end{array}$
Black proceeds systematically.

```
11 KR-B1
```

On his part, White, who has played over-cautiously, apparently now contemplates action culminating in $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 3$ and, after due preparation, P-QN4, But it is too late for this plan. $11 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Q1}$ is better under the circumstances.

$$
11 . .
$$

$$
\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 4
$$

$$
\ldots
$$

As 12 P-QN3, QN-R3 13 QR-N1 fails against $13 \ldots$ B-B4, White realizes he must act in the center instead.

| $12 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | 14 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 1$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| $13 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $\mathrm{QN}-\mathrm{R} 3$ | 15 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\cdots$ |

The star move-though not played at the star time-still offers chances.

| 15 CO | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| $16 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P} \dagger$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| $17 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B} \dagger$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ |


$18 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5+$ !
With this clever coup, White hopes to justify his strategy.

```
18 . .. .
1 9 ~ P \times P
20 B-B3
```

$P \times N$
$P-Q N 3$
$\ldots$.

Threat: to win a Rook by 21 P-K5.

```
20....
\(\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 1\)
21 PxN
\(\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}\)
```

White's combination has failed to produce a fully satisfactory result. Black has a slight edge because of his more compact Pawn formation.

$$
22 \text { P-QN4 }
$$

A new combinational attempt to rectify matters-very deep, but not forcing enough.


Black does not fall for his opponent's main line: 23 . . N-Q6? 24 NxP§, NxR 25 NxB $\dagger$ : K-N2 26 P-K58, KxN 27 PxR. and Black's Knight is trapped: 27 ... N-Q6 28 B-K2 or $27 \ldots$ R-QB1 28 P-Q7.

| $24 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $25 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | K 23 |
| $26 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ |

Black still has the better of it, in view of the Pawn formation mainly.

## 27 P-K5 $\dagger$

For the third time, White tries to save his endangered game tactically; but, for the third time, he fails.

| 27 | R | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{KP}$ | $30 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 6 \dagger$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 28 | $\mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{R}$ | Q 2 |  |
| $29 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $31 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| 29 | $32 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$ | $\cdots$ |  |

Off-hand, it looks as if White has achieved his aim, but he hasn't. Now Black wins the finish as if by magic. The close co-operation of his four fighting men and the ostracized position of White's King decide.

$$
32 \ldots
$$

P-K5!
Black is going to operate with mating threats and, for this, his passed Pawn is stronger than White's.

$$
\begin{array}{lrr}
33 & \text { P-R5 } & \text { P-K6 } \\
34 \text { K-B1 } & \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 4! \\
35 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 1 & \cdots
\end{array}
$$

Or 35 P-R6, N-Q5 and, this time, the mate threat leads to a win.
$\dagger=$ check; $\ddagger=$ dbl. check; $\S=$ dis. ch.

| $35 \ldots \mathrm{R} \dagger$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q5}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $36 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 7 \dagger$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| $37 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 6 \dagger$ | $\ldots$ |

On 37 RxP, R-N7! the tight is over. 37 K-Q2
Black will play it the safest way.
$38 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 7 \dagger$
K-B1
39 R-K7
. . .

White has nothing better- 39
R-N7 again threatens mate-so he loses his Knight.

| $39 \ldots \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 7!$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| $40 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ |  |

And the fight is over.

| 41 R-K7 | R-N2 | 43 | K-B2 | N-B3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $42 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ | K $\times$ R | 44 | K-K3 | NxP |
|  |  |  | Resigns |  |

## Bishop on the Rim

In this game, Black has a Knight on the rim. This notorious factor, however, serves surprisingly well as the Knight immolates itself and the Bishop which captures it becomes out of play in turn for a number of moves. Meanwhile Black, operating with more surprises, obtains a winning attack on the other flank. A fascinating game.

## GRUENFELD DEFENSE

B. Malich
R. Ballinas East Germany

Philippines
White

| 1 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | 4 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 2 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB4} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KN} 3$ | 5 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| 3 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | 6 PxP | $\ldots .$. |  |

6 B-K2, P-B3 leads to the Schlechter Variation of the Slay Defense. White hopes for better.

| $6 \ldots$ | $N \times P$ | 8 | $B-N 3$ | $N-B 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 7 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | 9 | $0-\mathrm{O}$ |
|  | $\ldots$ |  |  |  |

White's last is a steady move. 9 $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR4}$ is a more enterprising, though not necessarily better, alternative which weakens the effect of $9 \ldots$ P-K4: e.g. 9 . . P-K4 10 P-R5, PxP 11 PxP, $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 212$ O-O with a good game for White, White also has a good game after $9 \ldots$ P-QR4 $10 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$. The catch may lie, however in 9 . . . N-R4 10 $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R} 2$ or $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ and, if 11 PxP , $\mathrm{BxN} \dagger$ the consequences of which are less clear and possibly satisfactory for Black.

| 9 | P-K4 | P-K4 | 11 | B-B2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4$ |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 4$ | 12 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\ldots$. |

The text is dubious, Much safer and promising for White is 12 P-QN4. $\mathrm{N} / 4-\mathrm{B} 513 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 3$ and, if $13 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$, $14 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 4$.

$$
12 \ldots \quad \text { P-B5 }
$$

The King-side situation offers Black strong attacking chances as is known especially from similar positions in the King's Indian Defense. Black usually
wins. Nonetheless, Malich has a special reason for entering upon this line.

13 P-QN3
Now White threatens to gain material by 14 B-R3 and possibly B-N4. Black must strive to save his off-side Knight and so be unable to push his King-side attack efficiently. Thus, apparently, White thinks, very plausibly. As open Queen-side lines must serve him very well, he can meet $13 \ldots \mathrm{~N}$ - Q2 simply by $14 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ : $14 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3$ in this instance is less convincing: 14 . . . R-B2 15 B-N4, P-B4.

| 13 . . . | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 4$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Has Black overlooked the threat? |  |
| $14 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| $15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 5$ |
| $16 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 1$ | $\ldots .$. |

Is this the end of the story since White wins a piece?


No. it is rather the beginning of the real story. Black's idea is that his attack must compensate for the piece as he now has excellent activity for his King Bishop which is usually inactive in this type of attack.

## $17 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N}$

$17 \mathrm{BxB}, \mathrm{QxB}$ leaves Black with the better Bishop and fine attacking chances at no cost.

| 17 M- | Q-R5 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 18 Q-Q3 | B-QB4 |
| 19 N-K2 | R-B3 |

Now the threat is $20 \ldots \mathrm{R}$ - R 3 . The game is in its most critical stage. It is not yet certain, although likely, that Black must win.

20 P-N3
White hopes to break the attack with his next move, but the attempt fails,

The main alternative, which might work, is $20 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 4, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 321 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3$ : e.g. 1) $21 \ldots$ PxP $22 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3$, and White ought to win; 2) 21 . . P-B6 $22 \mathrm{NxP}, \mathrm{PxN}$ 23 QxP, and White has the edge; 3) 21 $\therefore$ P-N6 $22 \mathrm{PxB}, \mathrm{BxP} 23 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$, and White ought to win; 4) $21 \ldots$ B-Q3! and Black probably wins; at any rate, his attack remains very powerful.

| $20 \ldots \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | Q-R6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 21 C |  |

White wins a decisive tempo, it appears as Black's Queen must retreat.

## (See diagram, top of next column)

$$
21 \ldots \quad \text { P-N6!! }
$$

This surprising rejoinder frustrates White's effort.


Position after 21 PXP

## 22 QxP $\dagger$

White decides to give up his Queenhis best try. After 22 RPxP, R-R3, Black wins. And he also wins, in all likelihood at least after $22 \mathrm{NxP}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 323 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$, B-KN5 24 KR-K1, PxP.

| $22 \ldots \ldots$ | $R-N 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 23 P-B5 | $R \times Q \dagger$ |
| 24. $\mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\ldots .$. |

So far, White has fine compensation for the Queen, but there are still surprises in the air.

| 24 | B-Q2 | 26 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $25 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $27 \mathrm{~N} / 2-\mathrm{B} 1$ | $\ldots$. |  |

Naturally, White wants to sustain the pressure on the King Pawn. After 27 N/3-B1, Black proceeds with 27.
$\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ followed possibly by . . N-B3-N5. 27 N×P!
Another surprise.

```
28 PxN
P-K5
```

Black recovers his piece as White's attacked Knight obviously cannot move.

| 29 | $R-Q 1$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| 30 | $\mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| 31 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |

A bit better is $31 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ in spite of the possibility of 31 . . . RxRt 32 RxR, BxP! ete.

```
31....
P-KR4 32 R-K1
. . . .
```

And now a blunder. But the position is untenable, any way. White has no satisfactory defense against the threat of $32 \ldots$ P-R5.


## Jewel at the End

The appeal in this game begins when Black launches an exceptionally brilliant combination at the end.

## BENONI DEFENSE

Y. Aloni

Israel
White

| 1 | P-Q4 | N-KB3 | 8 | PxP | BxP! |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | P-QB4 | P-B4 | 9 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | Q-R4 |
| 3 | P-Q5 | P-KN3 | 10 | Q-Q2 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| 4 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{QB3}$ | P-Q3 | 11 | B-K2 | N-Q2 |
| 5 | P-K4 | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | 12 | O-O | N/2-K4! |
| 6 | P-KR3 | O-O | 13 | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}$ ! | P×N |
| 7 | B-K3 | P-K3 | 14 | KR | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q}$ |

The game is fairly in the balance, but now White blunders.

$$
15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3
$$

$$
B \times R P
$$

White has lost an important Pawn: 16 PxB?? N-B6 $\div$ or 16 BxN, KPxP. Now all he can do is to play for complications; so he does.

| $16 \ldots$ | $P \times P$ | 21 | $P-R 4$ | $P-B 4$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| $17 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5$ | $22 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$ |  |
| $18 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{N} 1$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ | $23 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |  |
| $19 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $24 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 5$ | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$ |  |
| $20 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | $25 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5$ |  |

Ultimately, White must lose no matter what he does: 26 Q-KN3, Q-K5 or 26 $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 2 . \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$ ete.

| $26 \ldots$ | Q-N5 | 28 | Q-N1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 27 | $R / 1-K B 1$ |  |  |
| 27 | $R-B 6$ | 29 | $R-K 4$ |



29
R×Pf!!
Here is the briliant combination.

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
30 P \times R & Q \times P \dagger \\
31 \text { K-R1 } & P-Q 6!!
\end{array}
$$

This is the ingenious and most exact point. The immediate threat is 32 $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 6 \dagger$.

## $32 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 7 \dagger$

Other possibilities are:

1) $32 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 6 \dagger 33 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 5 \dot{+}$ $34 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 7$, and Black wins;
2) $32 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 1, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7$ and now Black wins quickly as white lacks $33 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 8$.
$\begin{array}{lrrrr}32 \ldots & \text { K-R1 } & 34 & \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 7 \text { ! } \\ 33 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Ki} 1 & \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 6 \dagger & 35 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{P} \dagger & \cdots\end{array}$
Black wins on 35 Q-Q1, B-Q5+1 36 $\mathrm{RxB}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 6 \dagger$ and $37 \ldots \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{KS} \dagger$.

The text move looks strong-but not after Black's reply!


White is helpless against the mating threats. After 37 QxQ, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} S(\mathrm{Q}) \dagger 38$ $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 2, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7$ t, Black wins the Queen.

## Abstractional Hazard

A player who concentrates on openings as Pachman does always runs some danger of one of his experiments failing. This gamelet illustrates the hazard of abstraction in the openings.

| NIMZO-INDIAN |  | DEFENSE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lajos Por | sch |  | Ludek | Pachman |
| Hungary |  |  | Czec | oslovakia |
| White |  |  |  | Black |
| 1 P-QB4 | N-KB3 | 3 | P-Q4 | B-N5 |
| $2 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | P-K3 |  | P-B3 |  |

This line is closely related to the Saemisch Variation, but less explored and so more difficult to assess.

P-Q4
The alternative $4 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 45 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$. BxN $\dagger$ leads to the Saemisch proper.

$$
5 \text { P-QR3 }
$$

$\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N} \dagger$
Tahl-Keres, won by Black, went: 5 ...B-K2 6 P-K4, PxKP 7 PxP, P-K4 8 P-Q5, B-QB4 9 B-N5, P-QR4 (page 20, Jan. 1960). Apparently, Pachman, the great expert on openings, thinks there is reason to improve on Keres' line.

```
6 PxB
P-B4
7 PxQP \(\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}\)
```

Black's last move is important. 7 . . . Pxp leads to a well-known line in which White obtains a powerful Kingside attack by P -K3 followed after due preparation by $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$.

## 8 PxP

White aims to deprive Black of easy targets in the center and to procure open lines for his Bishops, too.

$$
8 \ldots \quad \text { P-B4 }
$$

On 8 . . . NxP, White gets little by $9 \mathrm{QxQ}+\mathrm{Kx}, \mathrm{K} 10 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$, $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 411 \mathrm{BxP}$, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 1$, or $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$. But $9 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$ is strong.

The text serves to isolate White's King Pawn if P-K4 is played.

| 9 | Q-B2 | Q-R4 | 11 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | QxP $\dagger$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | P-K4 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | 12 | Q XQ | $N \times Q$ |
|  |  |  | 13 | B-Q3 |  |

$13 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ fails against 13 . . NxP, the point in isolating the King Pawn.

$$
13 \ldots \quad N-Q 2
$$

This is an error, probably made in pre-analysis. The general line may or may not be good enough for approximate equality. It turns on the complications after 13 . . B-Q2 14 B-N2, B-N4.

| 14 | B-K3 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 15 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{QB} 2$ | $\ldots$ |

Now 16 B-Q4 is a threat.

$$
15 \ldots \quad N-B 5
$$



16 B-Q2!
Probably, it is this fine move which Black failed to consider in time, expecting only $16 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 4$, which is met effectively by $16 \ldots \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 417 \mathrm{BxP}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KN} 1$.
16.
$\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{B}$
On 16 . . . N-N4 17 B-Q3! White wins two Knights for a Rook: 17 NxP 18 RxN! NxR 19 B-B1 etc.

| $17 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 4$ | 20 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| $18 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $21 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 5$ | $\mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |  |
| $19 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | 22 | $\mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{QN} 1$ | $\ldots$ |

Now White's superior activity is a decisive factor: e.g. Black has no adequate defense to the threat of $23 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 4$, N-K1 24 N-R5.
$22 \ldots \quad \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 1$
The text parries that threat but leads to disaster all the same.


Black can hold on for a while but only if he sacrifices the Exchange:

1) $23 \ldots \mathrm{PxP} 24 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 6 \dagger$, K-B2 25 $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 7 \dagger$. K-Q3 $26 \mathrm{NxB}, \mathrm{RxN} 27 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1 \uparrow$, and White wins a Rook;
2) 23 . BxP 24 NxB , and (a) 24 $\ldots$ PxN 25 B-R6t, and White wins at least the Knight: 25 . . . K-Q2 [25 . . . $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 226 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 7 \dagger, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 327 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1+$ et.. $]$ 26 KR-Q1广, N-Q3 27 P-K5 or $26 \ldots$. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 227 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 7 \dagger$ etc, or (b) $24 \ldots \mathrm{RxB}$ and Black prolongs the game but to no good point.

## Better But Still Not Good

Black dares to pursue rather far the line which failed disastrously in the Fischer-Benko game from the U. S. Championship (page 145, May 1964). He launches an improvement which leads to more of a fight but is still in-sufficient-as White, playing with great accuracy, perfectly demonstrates.

## PIRC DEFENSE

| B. Bednarski |  | Y, Kraidman |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Israel |  |  |

Except for some insignificant changes in the sequence of moves, the opening is the same as that of the game cited. As Kraidman must have seen that game, it appears he has some essential improvement in mind.

13 . . .
Avoiding Benko's 13 . . . N-K1, Kraidman starts to play his own game, offering a Pawn sacrifice which defies acceptance.

## (See diagram, top of next column)

$140-0$
On 14 BxP or NxP, Black obtains too strong an attack: $14 \ldots$ NxB 15 NxN ,


Position after 13 . . . P.QN4
N-K5 16 Q-B3, Q-R5 $\dagger$ and, e.g., 17 P-KN3, NxP 18 B-B2, Q-N5 $\dagger$.

Similarly, $14 \mathrm{BxN}, \mathrm{PxB} 15 \mathrm{NxP}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1\rangle$ favors Black strongly: $16 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 5$ ! etc. or $16 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3 \div$ ! etc. or $16 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ or $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ ! etc.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 14 \ldots \\
& 15 \\
& \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 4
\end{aligned}
$$

P-B4
Accepting the sacrifice is still out of the question: $15 \mathrm{NxP}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{NI}$ and, if $16 \mathrm{NxP}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ ! or $15 \mathrm{BxN}, \mathrm{BPxB} 16 \mathrm{NxP}$, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 1$ etc. Black can continue otherwise: he has considerable choice but at least recovers the Pawn in a superior position.

White spoils his opponent's design, however, by playing consistently on the backwardness of Black's King Pawn and exerting the power of his Two Bishops.

| $15 \ldots$ | $P-B 5$ | 17 | $B-K 4$ | QR-Q1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $16 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{N} \dagger$ | QxN | 18 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\ldots$. |

Almost winning the Knight.

$$
18 \ldots \quad K R-K 1
$$

The Knight has no retreat: 18
N-B3? 19 BxN, QxB 20 P-B6! But Black aims to recover the piece now after $19 \mathrm{PxN}, \mathrm{PxP}$.
$19 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$
K-R1
20 QR-K1
....

Now the Knight is virtually trapped. For, after 20 . . . N-B3 $21 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5$ : QxB 22 BxN, White wins a number of Pawns.

$$
20 \text {. . . . }
$$

P-N5
Black is not taken by surprise: he turns the trapping of the Knight into a combination of considerable promise.

$$
\begin{array}{lrr}
21 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{N} & \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} \\
22 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 1 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 6
\end{array}
$$

Now Black has only one Pawn for his piece but aims to establish by . . . P-B6 Pawns abreast on the sixth rank. This achievement will be more than sufficient compensation for the piece.


23 P-QN3!
White meets the danger with perfect tactical alertness. He threatens to elim-
inate the crucial Pawn just when 23 . P-B6 is prohibitive because of 24 BxP : 23 B-R3
Black is eager to prevent 24 NPxBP. He can get in . . P-B6 by sacrificing the Exchange: 23 . . RxB 24 RxR. P-B6. But, after 25 Q-K3, Black can win only the Bishop for his Pawns and remains the Exchange down: e.g. 25 . . P-Q7 26 R-K8t, B-B1 27 RxR, QxR 28 BxP, QxB [28 . . PxB 29 R-Q1] 29 QxQ. PxQ $30 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 331 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 4, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 2$ 32 P-KR4! and the Queen Pawn falls, after which Black can resign.

```
24. BxB
Q\timesB
25 B-B3!
```

. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q}$ 7, the

Not 25 PxP as, after $25 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 7$, the Bishop falls.

```
25....
\(\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}\)
```

25 . . P-B6 is met by $26 \mathrm{RxR} \uparrow, \mathrm{RxR}$ 27 Q-Q4* and 28 QxQP.

$$
26 \text { Q×R! P-B6 }
$$

Black has achieved his original objective, but under less favorable terms.

27 Q-K7!
This Queen penetration gives White an attack which moves faster than Black's Pawns.


27
27 . . . .
Q-Q3
Black has nothing better, On $27 \ldots$ R-KB1, White wins by 28 QxNP with threats of $29 \mathrm{QxP} \dot{\mathrm{j}}$ and $29 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 4 \dagger$, and 28 . . Q-N2 fails against $29 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6$.

$$
28 Q \times B P \quad P-B 7
$$

On 28 . . . P-Q7, 29 B-Q1 blockades the Pawns, But the text is little better. 29 B-K4!
The threat is $30 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 231 \mathrm{QxQ}$. RxQ 32 BxQP! RxB 33 P-B7.

| $29 \ldots$ | $Q-K R 3$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Counter threat: $30 \ldots$ | $P-B 8(Q)$. |
| 30 Q-K7 | $R-Q B 1$ |

Or $30 \ldots$. Q-Q3 31 P-B6 etc.

$$
\begin{array}{llr}
31 & \text { Q-K5 } \dagger & \text { Q-N2 } \\
32 & \text { P-B6 } & \text { Q-QB2 }
\end{array}
$$

On $32 \ldots$ Q-KB2 33 Q-N2, White wins: e.g. 33 . . R-Q1 34 BxQP, RxB 35 QxP.

$$
32 \text { Q-Q4! }
$$

After 33 QxQ. RxQ, White camnot stop the Pawns: e.g. $34 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 7, \mathrm{RxP}$ !

$$
33 \ldots \quad \text { Q-N3 }
$$

White's threat of mate by P-B7 leaves Black no choice.

$$
34 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}!
$$

Now swapping Queens wins as White's passed Pawn can reach the seventh rank safely.
$34 \ldots$.
35 P-B7
$P \times Q$

Nothing works: 35 . . . P-B8(Q) 36 P-B8(Q) $\overline{\text {, }}$, RxQ 37 RxQ; or 35 $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 236 \mathrm{BxQP}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 8(\mathrm{Q}) 37 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B8}(\mathrm{Q}) \dagger$ etc.
36 BxBP
$\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 2$
37 R-B2!
Resigns

## Call It an Oversight

Conventionally speaking, White wins this game by a fine sacrifice of the Exchange. Actually, however, he does not sacrifice but makes what can be called a "change combination." He gives a Rook for adequate compensation. "Adequate" in these cases is a minor piece plus one or two Pawns, which is as near as can be arithmetically totaled up. Here White gets only one Pawn, but in an extremely favorable setting, positionally.

The outstanding feature of the game, therefore, is not the "sacrifice" itself, but Black's failure to avoid it. That's a gross oversight on his part.

## CATALAN OPENING

| B. Anderson | W. Unzicker <br> West |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denmark |  | Germany |

The game is in the balance, but white has a threat.

15
5 . . .
KR-Q1
Black not only overlooks the threat but makes it even stronger. He ought to move his Queen Bishop, playing 15 $\ldots \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q}^{4}$ or $15 \ldots \mathrm{BxN}$.

$16 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ !
The decisive "change combination."

$$
16 \underset{ }{16} \begin{array}{lr}
\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 5 & \mathrm{PxR} \\
\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 1
\end{array}
$$

The Pawn is indefensible: 17
Q-K1 18 NxQBP! QxN $19 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 6 \dagger$; but Black must retain the Exchange and so has little choice now: 17 . . . R-K1 is merely a transposition of moves.

| $18 \mathrm{~N} \times$ QBP | R-K1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 19 P-QR3 | B-Q3 |
| 20 P-B4 | $\ldots$ |

The game is materially more or less even; but, obviously, White has a great positional advantage. There can hardly be any doubt as to the issue.

For a player of Unzicker's high category, his oversight must be classified as a blunder of the gravest kind. There is actually little difference between Unzicker's failure here and Anderson's against Uhlmann in the same tournament.*

| 20 | N. | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | 23 BxP | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| $21 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $24 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3$ |  |
| $22 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | 25 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 6$ | $\mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{QB} 1$ |

Black has lamentably little scope for his Rooks.

$$
26 \text { N/3-K5 }
$$

Now $27 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 7 \dagger$ can mate or win the Queen: 27 . . K-R1 28 N-N67, K-R2 $29 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 8 \div$ or $27 \ldots \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 128$ Q-R7.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
26 \ldots & K-R 1 \\
27 & R-K B 1
\end{array} \quad R-B 10
$$

In a hopeless position, one move is as good as another. This one loses the Queen. Yet one can hardly call it an error. **

$$
2 \varepsilon \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KN} 4!
$$

Resigns
The Queen has no retreat.

* De gustibus and all that, for oll taste, White made a fine sacrifice of the Exchange fortified by the 17 N -K5, 18 NxQBP! and 19 N-B6\% as the stinger. Whe झive the Uhlmann-Anderson tame as Mr. Kmoch presents it for comparison: I P-Q4, N-KB3 $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB}+\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3 \quad 3 \quad \mathrm{~N}$-K1 2 B , P-QN3 \& N-B3, B-N5 5 Q-B2, B-N2 6 B-N5, P-KR3 7 B-R4, P-Q3?? [ef aiso Suemiseh-(apablanca. Karlsbad 1929$]$ \& Q-R1*. N-B3 9 P-Q5, Re-signs.-Ed.
* Contrariwise! The hish cutczory player fights to the last-or it is a binnder.-Ed.
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## Oil on the Fire

The Petrosyan Attack, with 8 B-KN5, bothered Black for some time. Then the Black side developed proper improve ments but only seemingly. But the rejuvenation of the attack by P-KR4 has put fresh oil on the fire. And so it stands now. One may wonder if Black will rise again.

## 'KING'S INDIAN DEFENSE

| Paul Keres <br> Soviet Union |  | E. Walther |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Switzerland |  |  |
| 1 P-Q4 | N-KB3 | 5 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | O-O |
| P-QB4 | P-KN3 | 6 | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | P-K4 |
| 3 N-QB3 | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | 7 | P-Q5 | QN-Q2 |
| 4 P-K4 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | 8 | B-N5 | P-KR3 |
|  |  | 9 | B-R4 |  |

This is the attack: an example of how it has been met is Najdorf-R. Byrne (page 286, September 1964).

| $9 \ldots$ B-N 3 | $P-K N 4$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| 10 | $N-R 4$ |
| 11 | P-KR4! |

Here is the rejuvenation. The annota. tor knows of no games to illustrate a good system of counterplay.

```
11.... P-N5
```

Alter $11 \ldots \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 5$ in almost the same position [with + . . P-QB4 instead of $\ldots$ QN-Q2], White won quickly in Ben-ko-Najdorf, Piatigorsky Cup Tournament, Los Angeles 1963 (page 288, September 1963).

$$
12 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 2
$$

$12 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ has also been played. Apparently, Keres contemplates a possible sacrifice on $K N \&$ at the proper moment.

| $12 \ldots$ | NxB | 15 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 13 PxN | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 4$ | $16 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |  |
| $14 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R} 3$ | $17 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | PxP |  |
|  |  | $18 \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\ldots .$. |  |

Obviously, White has a fine game because of the King-side situation. In the long rum, he may lodge a Knight on KBj and so practically spell finish.

| $18 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 1$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $19 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 2$ |
| $20 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |

Black improves his game positionally by swapping off his backward Pawn but. incurs severe tactical troubles as his King almost completely lacks Pawn protection. For the moment, though, Black has a strong threat: $21 . ., \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$ !

$$
21 \text { PxP! }
$$

N×P
Retaining the Knight may be more desirable; but 21 . . BxP 22 BxB leaves Black with no satisfactory recapture:

1) On 22 . . NxB 23 RxN: RxR 24 NxP, PxN 25 QxPi, White wins. And he gets a winning advantage on 24. . $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 225 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 3$ followed by 26 QxP . Finally, and debatable to some degree, on $24 . . \mathrm{Q}^{2} \mathrm{~KB} 125 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 2$ ! with 26 $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ or 25 . . R-B7 26 QxRP intended, White has superior compensation for the Exchange:
2) On 22 . RxB 23 NxP ! PxN 24 RxR, NxR 25 QxPt, N-N2 26 Q-N6: White has a winning attack.

$$
\begin{array}{lrr}
22 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N} & \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B} \\
23 \mathrm{R} / 1-\mathrm{KB} 1 & \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 3
\end{array}
$$

Despite Black's Two Bishops and sutperior Pawn formation, he is in great trouble as his Kingside is still too weak for the middle game. The text move fails; but the alternatives $23 \ldots$. Q-Q2 $24 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 4$ and $23 \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 224 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 4$ are not much better.


24 NxP !
Here is the proper moment mentioned in the note to move 12 .

| $24 . \operatorname{PrN}$ | $P \times N$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| 25 Q×NP | $K-R 2$ |
| 26 P-R5! | $B-Q 6$ |

Obviously, White's advantage is decisive: he has two mighty Pawns and a powerful attack as more than compensation for his piece.

Curiously, Black has no other move.

| $27 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R} / 1$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| $28 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 7$ |
| $29 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ |

White wins on $29 . . \operatorname{BxN} 30 \mathrm{QxB}$, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 131 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 232 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 6$. 30 R-B7
The threat is $31 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 6$ and mate next. 30

Q-K1
Now Black can meet 31 Q-N6 with 31 . QxR! 32 QxQ. BxN. 31 NXP !
The finishing touch.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
31 . \cdots & \text { Q-R5 } \\
32 \text { Q-N5 } & \cdots \ldots
\end{array}
$$

The threat is 33 Q-B6\%, K-N1 34 $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{BxN}$ [else $35 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 7 \dagger$ etc.] $35 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 236 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 6$ or $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 6$ etc.


Removing the King from a possible check, White has effective attacking moves to hand.

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
35 \ldots & \text { Q-R2 } \\
36 \text { Q-K6 } \dagger & \text { Resigns }
\end{array}
$$

After 36 . , K-R1 $37 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 7 \mathrm{\dagger}$, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 2$, there is the murderous $38 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 6 t$ :

## "Better" than the Best

An unrefuted error by achieving what. is normally unachievable works better than the best move sometimes. Black rejects a slow win for a faulty combination, and wins quickly and very beautifully in this game.

RUY LOPEZ


In this line, the Worrall Attack with 6 Q-K2, Marshall's Pawn sacrifice (here known as the Tartakover Counterattack) is even more promising than in the Marshall line proper against $6 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$. Consequently. White proceeds more safely with $10 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ and, if $10 \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5$, then $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$.

| $10 \ldots \ldots$ | P-K5! |
| :--- | ---: |
| $11 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 5$ |
| 12 Q-K3 | $\ldots$. |

Here white merely loses time. 12 P-Q4, PxN 13 Q-Q3, PxP 14 R-K1 is preferable, as suggested by Dueckstein in Schach-Echo.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
12 \text {... } & \text { PxN } \\
13 \text { P-N3 }
\end{array}
$$

13 P-Q4 is still better. Now the Pawn on KB6 is a most obnoxious intruder.

| $13 \ldots$ | R-K1 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 14 P-Q4 | B-QB4 |
| 15 Q-Q3 | $\ldots$. |

$15 \mathrm{PxB}, \mathrm{RxQ} 16 \mathrm{BxR}$ is a reasonable try for White with enough material compensation for the Queen. So far as his King safety is concerned, he has that problem anyhow: a possible continuation is $16 \ldots \mathrm{Q}$ QB1 $17 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ [or 17 $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R4}$ ! ]. B-R4 $18 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ ! to meet $18 \ldots$ Q-R6 by 18 B-KB1.

| $15 \ldots \ldots$ | $Q \times P$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $16 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Q}$ |
| $17 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\ldots$ |

The text is the best white can manage in his bad position.


17
R-K7
It is here that Black contemplates his faulty combination. 17 . . B-R6 is best as it wins the Exchange: $18 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q1}$, N-N5! or 18 NxP, BxR 19 NxB? R-K8.

| $18 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ? |
| :--- | :--- |
| $19 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ |
| $20 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | $\cdots$ |

And here White fails to refute that combination. Correct, as Dueckstein points out, is $20 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 1$ ! $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 821 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ ! RxR $22 \mathrm{BxB}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 523$ BxRP, RxP 24 B-Q3, NxR 25 BxN with advantage to White.

By way of compensation for those mutual errors, the reader can now follow a very attractive finish.

| $20 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 8 \dagger$ | $22 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 5+!!$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 21 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R} \dagger!$ | $23 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1$ |$\quad \cdots \cdot$.

One beautiful point is that, on 22 KxR, Black mates by 23 . . . P-B7. As it is, White can only postpone mate.



## THE BRAZILIAN DIAMOND

The archives dub this Evans Gambit, Caldos Vianna versus A. Silvester, Rio de Janeiro 1900, the Brazilian diamond. While it has some perceptible flaws, it abounds in tactical brilliance. The finale is particularly pleasing. The game begins: 1 P-K4, P-K4 $2 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$, N-QB3 3 B-B4, B-B4 4 P-QN4, BxP 5 P-B3, B-R4 6 P-Q4, PxP $70-0$.

Cover scoring table at line indicated. Set up position, make Black's next move (exposing table just enough to read it). Now guess Whit's 8th move, then expose it. Score par, if move agrees; zero, if not. Make move actually given, Black's reply. Then guess White's next, and so on.
COVER WHITE MOVES IN TABLE BELOW, EXPOSE ONE LINE AT A TIME


SCALE: 75-100-Excellent; 55.74-Superior; 40-54-Good; 25-39-Fair

## Notes to the Game

a) $10 \ldots \mathrm{KN}-\mathrm{K} 2$ consolidates; the text leaves Black exposed in the center and the wings. b) The only hope for freedom; $20 \ldots \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Nl}$ is met by $21 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 3^{*}$ etc.
c) $22 \ldots \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ is better; on $23 \mathrm{RxN} \uparrow$, QxR 24 R-KB1, Black amasses much material for the Queen,
d) Inveigled by the discovery; $24 \ldots$ QxQ 25 $\mathrm{NxQ}, \mathrm{BxP}$ is to be preferred.
e) Now White threatens a mean discovery in his turn.
*Position after 28 . . . K-R2

$\dagger=$ check; $\ddagger=$ double check; $\ddagger \div$ dis. check

## QUEEN'S GAMBIT DECLINED - the Vienna Variation

The Vienna Variation was first employed against the Queen's Gambit Declined in the thirties; it seemed to be an ideal variation for those players who, with the Black pieces, were aiming for a win, instead of a draw.

In this variation, serious complications arise around the tenth move, and sacrifices-even of the Queen-are in the air all the time.

In the early years of its application, the challenge of the Vienna Variation was regularly accepted, and improvements for White and Black were found alternately. Then came a period of standstill.

Black
1 P-Q4
P-Q4
The Vienna can also arise after a bit of jockeying, of course: e.g. 1 N-KB3 2 P-QB4, P-K3 3 N-KB3, N-KB3 4 B-N5. It is characterized primarily by $3 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$, instead of $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{QB3}$, and 4 $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{KN} 5$ and by Black's sharp re-action on the dark squares with (see below) ... B-QN5,
P-QB4.

| 2 P-QB4 | P-K3 |
| :--- | :---: |
| 3 N-KB3 | N-KB3 |
| 4 B-N5 | $\cdots .$. |

If White wishes to avoid the Vienna, he can quietly play $4 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$; but then his chances of getting an opening advantage are probably minimal.

| $4 \ldots-\mathrm{N}$ | B 5 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 5 N-B3 | P×P |
| 6 | P-K4 |



The Basic Position
It seems as though White can attain a clear superiority by P-K5. Another possibility is 7 BxP .

## Variation I.

## 7 P-K5

After this obvious move, it seems 7 P-KR3 is forced. Then, however,

White gets a considerable advantage by 8 PxN, PxB 9 PxNP, R-N1 10 PxP.

PxP!
This is one of the points of this tricky variation.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 8 \text { Q-R4 } \dagger \\
& 9 \text { O-O-O }
\end{aligned}
$$

N-B3
Here already is a stage of great complications. The position is very difficult and well worth thorough examination by anyone planning to take it on. The line has become old-fashioned, however, and so only the main consequences are given here.

$$
9 \ldots \quad \text { B-Q2 }
$$

This is a promising sacrifice, the high light of the Vienna. Various books point out the inadequacy of $9 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3$ (Vidmar-Bogolyubov, Nottingham 1936).

| $10 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| $11 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $12 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 4$ | $\ldots .$. |



The key position for this line.
It ought to be noted here that $12 \ldots$ $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 5$ is refuted by 13 QxN : BxQ it NxP市, K-B1 15 RxP, Q-R4 16 NxB $\dagger$, K-K1 17 N-B6t, K-B1 18 BxP (FineGruenfeld, Amsterdam 1936).
$\dagger=$ check; $\ddagger=$ dbl. check; $\S=$ dis. ch.

No longer was White giving his opponent the opportunity to play the Viemna. On the other hand, on those rare occasions when Black was given the opportunity, he did not take it as a rule.

This last year, however, new life in the Viema Variation has appeared. So it is important to signalize the games which have employed this opening and to strike a balance so we may arrive at a definite conclusion about the value of the variation.

In the following study, the effect of the most recent games is considered against the parallel ones of hitherto standard usage.

1) $18 \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 319 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 4 \%, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 120$ $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 321 \mathrm{BxR}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B} 22 \mathrm{BxP}$ ! BxB $23 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 6$;
2) 18 . . . P-B4 $19 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1 \uparrow$, K-K1 20 $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3!\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 121 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 6$.

Still and all, the issue is not entirely clear. So it is comprehensible that White may wish for a more solid continuation which yet guarantees a sure advantage. Also, he may want to avoid the great complications of Variation I.

## Variation II.

As matters now stand, it seems as though white may indeed obtain an advantage by choosing Variation II. On the other hand, however, this continuation is neither more nor less solid than Variation I. The resulting complications, also, are about of the same level.
(Continue from the Basic Position)

| 7 BXP | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| 8 NXP | $\ldots$. |



It is from this position that two recent games have departed.

## Subvariation A

8....
Q-R4

For years, this was the most popular move; but it doesn't seem satisfactory. $9 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N}$
This capture is practically forced, but also very strong.

| $9 \ldots \ldots$ | $B \times N \dagger$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $10 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{Q} \mathrm{P}_{\dagger}$ |
| $11 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B} \dagger$ |

On 11
PxB 12 R-B1, Q-R4 13 B-N5†, K-K2 14 P-K5! White obtains a tremendous attack: $14 \ldots$ PxP 15 Q-R5.
$12 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1$

$12 \ldots \quad \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$
This, unfortunately for Black, is the only reasonable continuation.
Here are two other possibilities, one more charming than the other:

1) $12 \ldots \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} 13$ Q-N4, P-N3 1 t Q-B4, N-C22 15 P-K5, NxB 16 PxN,
$\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 117 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 4^{*} 18 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 6, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KN} 1$ 19 N-B3! Q-R4 20 N-N5! ! (analysis by Kotov):
2) 12
$\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ [12 . . PxB is refuted of course by $13 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{Q}$ away $14 \mathrm{RxB} \dot{1}$ and 15 RxR$] 13 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 3$ 14 NxP!! PxN $15 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 8 \dot{7}$ ! K-B2 16 RxR . PxB 17 Q-R5 $\uparrow, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 218$ Q-B5 $1, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ 19 RxP + , K-N1 20 (2-K7, Resigns (Alek-hine-Bogolyubov, Warsaw 1941).

## 13 R-B1

Q-R3
On $13 \ldots$ QxP. White has 14 BxP , R-KN1 15 N-N5 etc. And, on 13
Q-N5, he has $14 \mathrm{BxP}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KN} 115 \mathrm{NxP}$ etc.

14 BxP
R-KN1


15 P-QR4!
Here is a convincing new move. Note that Black cannot take the Bishop: 15 $\ldots \mathrm{RxB} 16 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 417 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 7 \dagger$, and White nets the Exchange.

```
15 ....
Q-Q3
16 B-R6 P-R3
```

$16 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 417 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5, \mathrm{QxQ} \mathrm{C}^{\dagger}$ is RxQ sets Black in a hopeless position.

## $17 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3 \quad \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 4$

The text is from Smyslov-Wade Havana 1964). 17 . . P P-K4 18 N-B5, $\mathrm{QxQ} \dagger 19 \mathrm{RxQ}$ is preferable here, though Black then has to cope with a bad endgame.

$$
\begin{array}{llrlr}
18 \text { Q-R5 } & \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 5 & 20 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5! & \text { R-N3 } \\
19 \text { Q×RP } & \text { Q-B1 } & 21 & \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B4} & \\
\text { And White won easily. }
\end{array}
$$

## Subvariation B

(Continue from diagram after $8 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{P}$ )

$$
8 \ldots \quad \text { Q-B2 }
$$

This move was recommended years ago by Ragozin; but it seems no more satisfactory than the 8 $\qquad$ . $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4$ of Subvariation A.**

## 9 Q-N3!

(See diagram, top of next column)
This is Averbakh's innovation: he declared he had already discovered the move in 1946 .

## $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N} \dagger$

[^6]

Position after $8 \ldots$ Q-B2
Nor do other moves solve the problem. On 9 ... NxP, White has $10 \mathrm{QxB}, \mathrm{NxB}$ $11 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ as he threatens $12 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 4$ or P-B4, trapping the Knight, as well as $12 \mathrm{~N} / 3-\mathrm{N} 5$ with a decisive attack. And, on $9 \ldots$ Q-B4 $10 \mathrm{BxN}, \mathrm{PxB} 11 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$, QxN 12 QxB, N-B3 13 Q-N3, White stands better: 13 . . . N-R4 14 B-N5 or 13 . . . O-O 14 QR-Q1.

$11 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5$
This fatal surprise occurred in Aver-bakh-Estrin (Moscow 1964).

| 11 | Q-B4 | 14 | K-Q1 | N -Q2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 QxP | R-B1 | 15 | R-K1 | N/5-B3 |
| 13 B-R6 | QxP $\dagger$ | 16 | BxP! | QXQNP |
|  |  | 17 | R-QB1 |  |



Black (Estrin) resigned-a spectacular finish.

"Queen that Pawn, Crandall, and you're a dead man!"
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TOURNAMENT NOTES Progress Reports for Golden Knights Tournaments

## 13th Annual Championship

In the 1959-60 Golden Knights, a hiatus exists this month as to significant results. See April issue for the list of present leaders.

As to completion of this tournament, only single (and over-due) results jam Finals sections 22, 24, 25 and 28 . But the last four have a good many results that are a long time from finishing.

## 14th Annual Championship

In the 1960-1 Golden Knights, Finals section, $60-\mathrm{Nf} 18$, has completed play, and the contestants therein earned these weighted point totals:*

R R Coveyou 42.4; S Crown 35.05: J F Healy 31.3; T F Leonard 27.4; G L Frank 20.5; J C Thoms 20.05; and P T Luks withdrew.

We ask players to be sure to get in results promptly, also report if oppo. nents are tardy. Many of the near-last of sections assigned have more reports in than mid-early assigned ones.

As last month, the last Finals is yet to be assigned, and we have but one more potential qualifier to be cleared.

## 15th Annual Championship

In the 1961-2 Golden Knights, Finals section, 61-Nf 1, has completed play, and the contestants therein earned these weighted point totals:*

D A Rosenberger 43.0; G Katz 37.2: J C Meyer and J B Slavich 36.1; A Donins 22.8; C Barasch 21.0; and V De Martino withdrew.

Most Finals sections have yet to conclude; and many contestants have yet to qualify to the Finals. The following contestants, however, have now qualified for assignment to the Finals: M. Ladacki, E. Lense, L. Wilson, J. Bauer, H. A. Fisher, R. Gonzalez, R. J. Trenkamp, J. F. Shaw and W. Weil, setting up one more Finals and leaving five waiting for more qualifiers.

## 16th Annual Championship

In the 1963 Golden Knights, the following postalites have qualified for assignment to the Finals:

P H Beckham, G Aguilera, A C May and G Goodman.

Also, the following have qualified for the Semi-finals:

E J Werner, H A Fisher, T R Dome, W W Buchanan and A J Stesko.

## 17th Annual Championship

No new Postalites have qualified for assignment to the Finals; but the following contenders have qualified for the Semi-finals:

R A Pease. C J Custer, G C Van de Carr. Mis C A Butland, P \& Leinweber. O Birsten, D A Young, F D Dulicai, E $S$ Itkin, $H$ R Ronan, $H$ F Wright, $R R$ Coveyon, J Cole, T A Willis, W D Howell, L S Ward, J McElroy, D Ballard, W Bland, H B Clay. H Rosenberg, K Domann. M W Herrick, G Prazak, M Sieget, A S Pemmiston, R A Cayford and C Shipley.

## 18th Annual Championship

In the 1965 Golden Knights, ninetytwo sections were in play by the end of March, all of 6.44 contestants. But we still await the first qualifier to the Semitinals.

## POSTALMIGHTIES! Prize Tournaments

These Postalites have won prizes in the 1963 and 1964 Prize Tournaments.

| Tourney | Players | Place | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $63 . \mathrm{P}$ | A C Chick | 1st | 42-12 |
|  | G M Story | 2-3 | 4-2 |
|  | J C Thoms | 2-3 | +-2 |
|  | J F Boshea | 1-3 | $4-2$ |
|  | H Kolin | 1-3 | (-2 |
|  | H J Rhode | 1-3 | 4-2 |
|  | A B Humplirey |  | 412-12 |
|  | W C Tingle | 2nd |  |
|  | W Alberts | 1st | 51-3 |
|  | I S Ward | . 2 nd | 312-21 |
| 6.4-P | C P Gratto | .1st |  |
|  | A. C Genz | .1-2 | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ |
|  | $B$ Plemel | .1-2 | 51- |
|  | A Wagner |  | 5120 |
|  | D Rivera | 1 st | $5 \frac{1}{2}-$ |
|  | R L Melton | 2nd | 5-1 |
|  | H Derring | 2nd | 43-12 |
|  | $1 \cdot \mathrm{Sixon}$ | 2-3 | +1 $\frac{1}{2}-1 \frac{1}{2}$ |
|  | T Twaiten |  | $1 \frac{1}{2}-1 \frac{1}{1}$ |
|  | $G$ Long |  | $5 \cdot 1$ |

## Class Tournaments

These Postalites have won or tied for first in 1963 and 1964 Class Tournaments.

| Tourney | Players | Place | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (63-C 76 | R N De Cost | 1st | $1-2$ |
| 77 | D S Stevenson | . 1 st | 42-1娄 |
| 80 | $V$ R Eoniila | . 1st | 5-1 |
| 8.4 | E O Anders | ..1st | 4t-1需 |
| 85 | J B Lewis | . 1st | 4-2 |
| 91 | D L Baker | .1st | 4-2 |
| 92 | Christa K Brau: | 1-2 | $4-2$ |
|  | İ B Horne | 1-2 | $4-2$ |
| 93 | D Strong' | .1st | 3-3 |
| 95 | R C Slater | , 1st | 31-24 |
| 96 | $J$ J Scheper | 1st | 4-2 |
| 98 | D M Noble | 1st | 4-2 |



## Erasures Illegal

The tinal statement of Rule 7 in the Postal Chess Rules is "Moves erased or otherwise visibly altered must be dealt with at once as illegal moves."

The point is to reply at once, not after 72 hours, asking for a legal move (explaining move was written over or altered) but not giving your reply. (A reply may "tip your hand.")

Why? A player who erases his move at the last moment is very apt not to correct his records to conform, and more apt to forget he sent the new move. If this move was a poor one-and last minute ideas often are-he will be convinced his opponent is prevaricating. And submission of the card to the judgment of the Postal Chess Editor is useless by then as he cannot tell who did the altering. He can rule only that the move is illegal. But a call for a new and clearly written move dissolves all cause for dispute. Make the call at once-it requires no analysis.

Of course, avoid sending altered moves. Repeated cases come under Rule 8: But. if you have a card all made out and feel you must change the move, strike it out -don't erase it-write in the new move with an apology and okay it with your initials.

## POSTAL MORTEMS

Game Reports Received
during March 1965
To report results, follow instructions on pages $4 \& 5$ of your booklet on Postal Chess strictly and exactly. Otherwise the report may be misrecorded, held up or even lost.
Please note: Winners (and those with the White pieces in case of draws) must report as soon as result is confirmed by opponent. The opponent may report also to ensure his record and rating going through but must then state clearly that he was the loser (or played Black in case of a draw).
Game reports sent in time for receipt by dates given above should be printed below. And the players concerned should check to see that they are so published. To spot them, look under your section number, first by the key (e.g., 63-C indicating Class Tourney begun in 1963) and by number (466) given in text below the key.

Symbol $f$ indicates a win by forfeit without rating credit; a shows a rating credit adjudication; df marks a double-forfeit.

## CLASS TOURNAMENTS

Four-man Tourneys Graded by Classes

## Started in 1963 (Key: 63-C)

Notice: Game reports on all tourneys begun in May 1963 become past-due during this month. Get in reports to reach us here before June 1st, to avoid losing on doubleforfeit (both players lose!).

Earlier tourneys have been closed. We are not publishing individual double-forfeits but are publishing winners now left by closing process on March 1963 tourneys in Postalmighties!
Tourneys 1-404: 110 Jewett and Robison tie. $13 \ddagger$ Adams downs. Belisle. 195 Burkhart, Hough tie. 223 Wartman loses one to Steich, two to Fazzolare. 233 Buturma bests Curtin. 236 Wallach tops Winkler twice. 244 Schulze conks Caster, 256 Chagnot, Sampson tie. 308 Woelfinger whips Gray: correction: Gray won one from Dawson. 314 Smith downs Dubowy, 333 De Souza licks Lohrman. 339 Nash tops Tarjan twice. 341 Hartnett tops Jarvis once and Neff twice. 379 Cassill conks Koken. 383 Eulenstein tops Shearman twice, 389 Birdwell. Noble tie. 351 Hart conks Capritta. 400 O'Donnell downs Litwin.

## Started in 1964 (Key: 64-C)

Tourneys 1.99: \& Steinbach ties Bancroft twice, Dyba once and loses to Dyba; Bancroft, Dyba tie. 7 Arneson ties Lay and tops Van Kulich. 9 Isaacson, Marcotte split two. 29 Howes halts Blumetti. 31 Kassian conks Beatty. 32 Genz licks Livingston. 44 Gray tops lution twice, 47 Smith withdrawn. 54 Fuller fells Scott and splits two with Bielfeldt. 57 Fuda, Volkman split two. 63 April tops Winkler twice but loses to Fattman. 64 Braun tops Butler twice, it Bustin beats Viets and Shake. 75 Probst mauls McGavin. 78 Joseph and Pantazi tie. 79 Lyon loses two to Mooney and splits two with Schremer. S2 Strelecky conks Kennedy. 83 Sage beats Baxter. \& Archer chops Gray. 90 Champney tops (2f) Leeper; correction: Handler won one from Champney. 98 Splvack spills Viets. 99 Gatuson tops Dahill twice.
Tourneys 100-149: 105 Bridges tops Barthe twice. 108 Sattinger socks Evans, 112 Heath halts Berndt. 113 D'Aoust withdraws. 114 Moore axes Eldridge. 115 Cunningham licks Lockton. 120 Mersereau mauls Snyder twice. 121 Beal bests Solomon twice. 122 Correction: Coulbourn won one from Schllesing, 124 Kline withdraws. 126 Kinslow axes Ebbs, 127 Schwartz licks Dallas twice but loses to Scheper. 128 Opp tops (2f) Bochichio. 130 Johnson jolts Miller and Stonkus. 133 Hanson splits two with Seybold and loses to Goodspeed; Goodspeed
withdraws. 134 Brant rips Roseman. 137 Lauer licks Angstenberger. 138 La Prade tops and ties Cooley. 141 Skotte bows twice to Seybold and splits two with Bielfeldt. 145 Kessler tops (2f) Kennedy. I4s Simpson hests Kohl twice but bows to Cassara; Cassara tops (2f) Kohl. 149 Chosak tops and tles Mueller and bests Blumetti.
Tourneys 150-189: 151 Griffin withdraws. 153 D'doust downs Myer wilce, 155 Lecker licks Wallach. 195 Ankstenberger halts Hodges. 157 Barnard whips Woodle. 159 Broyles whips MeWillams, 160 liwer and Feeney tie; Biwer and Fugleberg best Webber. 161 D'Aoust withdraws. 163 Kessler conks Ppatt. 165 Faus trips Trimingham twice. 167 Berry and Blumetti each top Brown twjce. 168 Booth tops Humphries and Tyner. 169 Jirousek jolts Bell. 170 Aderholdt bows twice to Garber but bests Baines; Chibnik withdraws. 171 Withers whips Sheldon. 172 D'Aoust withdraws. 173 Slocum whips Westbrook; Slocum and Scherrer each top (1a) Parmelee. 174 Hempel halts Schlisser. 177 Moore tops Muir twice. 180 Engel, Kyker split two. 181 Moyer whips Welch. ISt Quintan quells Watson. 186 Larzelere licks Gray and loses to Cuschleg. 187 Sorensen conks Kessler. 189 Lavender tops Miller twice, Shearman once.
Tourneys 190-234: 190 Fee fells Yeakel. 191 Rasmussen rips Elumetti, 198 McCrossen beats Beal. 199 Bohnen and Hendricks maul Zechman. 200 Sciarretta tops Eldredge twice: Scruggs withdraws. 203 Pittman halts Hughes. 205 Riegler tops (2t) Hurst. 208 Sidrys socks Goebel. 210 Brain and Scruggs withdraw. 211 Wong whips Brown. 212 Shaffer downs Demmiston. 213 Milas tops Miller twice: Mantell tops (2f) Kanig. 214 Becker and Chick chop Sprague. 215 Jimenez bows to Dubin but bests Zucker and Denniston. 216 Ellis axes Frand: Faires fells Zinck. 220 O'Neil nips Gordon. 221 Thurman rips Riegler. 222 Refia routs Brown. 223 Steele stops Kinslow. 224 Shepard mauls Martin. 225 Collins conks Denniston twice. 227 Dittman downs Kinslow; Mulkerin withdraws. 228 Jones jolts Cassill. Germain tops (2f) Polillo. 231 Schreiner loses to MeCrossen and Blake and ties Humphreys. 233 Clark and Sharpe clip Zonies.
Tourneys 235-269: 235 Angstenberger tops Woodle and Franaszek, 237 Sauriol socks Zonies, 238 Mantell tops Paplaskas. 240 Songy socks Van Cise. 241 Gross loses to Slomowitz but licks Angelis. 246 Aks rips Russell. 247 Williams smites Smith. 249 Pipher tops Dombrowski twice: Hintzen bests Goldberger. 250 Angstenberger beats Coveyou and (a) Polillo but bows to Fattman; Polillo withdrawn. 251 Davis downs Benski. 252 Welling whips Hogan: Pariza outpoints Savary. 253 Klawitter nips Noble. 254 Boyd beats Croyle. Cross tops Anders twice and Westhrook once. 256 Ogulnick tops Holecy and Zerar twice each and splits two with Pantaxi; Pantazi halts Holecy twice. 257 Shaffer bests Bancroft. 260 Angstenberger halts Hempel. 261 Jachens jolts Schleidt. 265 Day downs Srown. 268 Lewis drubs Andrus and (2f) Waltner.
Tourneys 270-319: 270 O-Neil tops Germain twice; Fox withdrawn. 271 Arnold rips Roberts. 273 Lirson and Stayart Lie. 274 Sussman socks Whitehead. 275 Goodspeed conks Kyser, then withdraws. 276 Shader mauls Miller. 279 Estabrook bests Baker twice. 281 Pampel bests Baldwin. 282 Strout strafs Blumett. 284 Kent conks Tabbat. 286 Dullea loses two to Gitlin, one to Lach. 288 Taylor tops Weber. 291 Silkowsk! tops Tomaino and White; Johnson withdraws. 292 Gustafson tops Blanke. 293 Goodspeed loses to Meschter, then withdraws. 294 Bocek and Daniel down Marcus. 295 Bruce conks Constantine, 296 Rosser withdrawn, loses (a) to Mitchell. 297 Correction: Struss won from Mantell. 298 Aro whips Wells. 305 Dalrympel downs Yeakel. 308 Spitz spills Abraham. 313 Pomillo axes Ellers. 317 Gerzadowicz conks Copeland. 319 Michaelson bows to Steffee but bests Dessaules twice,
Tourneys 320-416: 326 Strong tops Cudrin twice. 329 Holmes halts Keeling. 330 Smith
smites Angstenberger. 331 Stevenson stops Sigler, 346 Himes whips Walleisa. 348 Flee withdrawn. 351 Mahon mauls Pransky. 352 Huckin, Warren tie. 353 Tarjan jolts Lane and Thomas. 355 Scheper beats Bratz twice. 359 Gary withdraws. 360 Spahn withdrawn. drops (a) to Burroughs, 361 Feunekes whips Welch. 362 Boss Keith split two. 364 Andrafn, Falk Lie. 377 Parcells tops Johnson twice. 381 Youmans and Kontra halt Fig. Hins. 382 Duperrault halts Harper, 39. Brown loses two to Folkman, then withdraws. 394 Wilson licks Lenig. 401 Eblos axes Glass; Hammond withdraws. 407 Grossman, Piracci tie. 411 Balawag beats Bram. 112 Harper withdraws, loses (a) to Bailey.

## Started in 1965 (Key: 65-C)

Tourneys 1-132: 10 MacConnell wins from Angstenberger. 12 Wilcox whips Wells. 25 MeCormack withdraws, loses (a) to Conner 26 Peach outpoints Volk. 45 Bordner bests Worden twice. 47 Shaffer stops Sprout.

## PRIZE TOURNAMENTS

## Seven-man Tourneys for Premiums

## Started in 1963 (Key: 63-P)

Notice: Game reports on all tourneys begun in May 1963 become past-due during this month. Get in reports to reach us here before June 1st, to avoid losing on double-forfeit (both players lose!).

Earlier tourneys have been closed. We are not publishing individual double-forfeits but are publishing winners now left by closing process on March 1963 tourneys in Postal. mighties!
Tourneys 1.112: 27 Birsten wins from Encinas. 45 Best beats Werner. 62 Epstein tops (f) Valsh. 63 Spohr spills Bailey: 75 Tingle tops Martin. 78 Weil nips Nelson. 79 Ash socks Sanm, 82 Harris halts Johnson. 8t Correction: Alberts won from Arnotd. 90 Borke and lynch tie. 93 Robinson and Roche tie. 98 Faires fells Shulman. 100 Valys rips Robison; Bartle bests Murphy, 105 Encinas axes Shepherd. 106 Parkinson spills Spear. 107 Bishop bests Carr: Milt. man withdrawn.

## Started in 1964 (Key: 64-P)

Tourneys 1-39: 1 Gribushin cracks Kramer 3 Gratto smites Smith. 4 Genz. Plemel tie. \& Becker bows to Garner but bests Hoover. 9 Hamilton and Lenz tie; Best and Mack Ife. 10 Kramer axes Encinas. 16 Reamer bests Buckendorf: Pease downs MeDonough. 17 Lach and Wagner lick Lawton: Riley routs Mayer; Desrochers withdrawn: Lach and Morrow tie. 18 Alherts and Sakarias beat Gieselman; Sakarias bests Alberts. 19 Tomas tops MeDonough. 25 Rauch and Rivera tie. 27 Genz loses to Trone but licks Woif. 2s Hathway and Svoboda tie. 29 Tainer tops Gwynn. 30 Derring downs Ashley. 36 Sorenson elips Broderick and Clarkson; Reynolds clouts Abrige and Clarkson. 39 D'Aoust downs Duignan.
Tourneys 40-59: 40 Robison wins (a) from Canter. 41 Itkin ties Becker bul loses to De Lieto. 42 Burgstahler withdraws. 43 Von Saleski smites Schmitt. 44 Burgstahler withdraws. 45 Battat and Riegel beat Bartlett: Stephens bows to Riegel but bests Battat. 47 Chenoweth and Itkin tie. 48 Moks rips Roby. 49 Mahrt licks Lawrence and loses to Hayes: Burgstabler withdraws. 50 Jany Jolts Ashley; Gorostiaga withdrawn, toses (a) to Lester. 51 Brison licks Larrabee. 52 Anderson tops Martin and ties Doren: D'Aoust withdraws. 54 Lerum and De Long best Orbanowski: De Long tops Gwymn. 55 Kolts conks Gildea; Wrans ties Koits and Nester, 57 Hawkinson, Du Dash and Thomas down Anderson; Du Dash tops Thomas. js Twaiten outpoints Petit.
Tourneys 60-79: 60 Vittes ties Tener. tops Wilson and (f) Polilio. 61 Cuschleg beats Best: D'Aoust withdraws, 62 Wojtowiez rips Ramthum; Smith withdrawn. 64 Carpenter slays Endsley. 65 Hujber halts Carr. 66 Ashley licks Lundstrom and Buckendorf: Scoles withdrawn, loses (a) to Lundstrom:

## THE FINISHING TOUCH

## (Coneluded from page 143)

The next sample involves an imnocent mix up, not only with positions reversed but also in source material. It is Cheron's No. 600.

Dedrle (D. Wochenschach 1921)
Fassung Moravec


White to move and win
The solution dramatizes a King triangulation, but with the King retreating to secure the win. And there is a tale attached to the very first move.
1 K-B2
P-R5!
P-R6
$\begin{array}{ll}4 & K-R 2 \\ 5 & K \times P \\ 6 & K-R 4! \\ 7 & K-N 4!\end{array}$
K-Q3
$\begin{array}{lll}2 & K-N 1! & P-R 6 \\ 3 & P-N 3!! & K-K 2\end{array}$
K-B3
K-N3

And now of course White wins.
Curiously, neither the heading nor the position are historically true in this context. First, the position was never constructed by Dedrle in this or any other form. The original of the theme is given in Tattersall (1910) with White: King on QB2, Pawn on QN2; Black: King on KB3, Pawn on QR4, and cited without source. A Dr. Cassidy discovered the solution: $1 \mathbf{K}-\mathrm{N} 1$ ! in 188 t .

Then the position was reproduced by Dedrle in a didactic article in 1910 and again in his book on end-game studies (1925) ; but he never claimed authorship and, in his context, it appears clearly as a mere quotation without citation of source.

Finally, in 1952, Moravec published a series of instructive adaptations of this same Pawn theme, in various versions in the Czech chess magazine, and his contribution was the intriguing addition of the first Black and White move and also the switch of Black's King to its first rank.

Both these actions are designed as improvements, artistically speaking, on the "Old Masters," a la the Troitzky improvement cited earlier. In addition, he "reversed" the whole position, placing White's King on KB1, Black's on QB1, and so on, apparently by way of training the reader to visualize different or similar positions from all possible angles.

For one final word, Chernev's Practical Chess Endings ${ }^{4}$ displays the basic Tattersall position (page 27 , diagram 16) with the legend "Dedrle 1921." This small inaccuracy is probably the one and only such the writer may find in Chernev's impressive book.

[^7] CHESS REVIEW.-W. K.

Kaminsky lops (f) Hayen. 67 Hoglund tops Stevens, ties Crosbie but loses to Van Schoor: Cassill stops Stevens. 68 Smith smites Carr. 69 Lacey and Simon tie. 71 Sample socks Marica and Mott. 73 Joseph tops Taylor and (a) Rader. 74 Morrill beats Bishop and Stephens. 75 Stevens tops Warci and Tarter; Stevenson whips Webber. 76 Aks stops Stevens. 77 McGowan, Goldberg and Cohen mob Fuchs. 78 Partlow bows to Carpenter but bests Myers. 79 Klein clips Rugs; Hynes hits Hurd.
Tourneys 80-109: 80 Goldwasser and Sample best Butler; Schwartz halts Hardin. \$1 Erkmanis mauls Meglis; Johnson withdraws. 82 Tomko topples Cassill. 83 Kaplan-Pera smears Smart; Humphrey halts Moody. 84 Wojtowicz loses to Joslin and ties Stayart: Stayart beats Burke. S5 Stayart stops Gellish, 86 Tweten tops Thoms, 90 Bullwinkel bests Parks: Ashley licks Worrell. 91 Baker bests Thomas. 92 Spohr whips Williams. 98 Robinson rips Kirchik; Helper stops Bronston. 95 Crivy cracks Graeff and Nester; Nester hips Graeff. 97 Reid, Kyker, Mangold and Tweten mob Natale: Kyker conks Mangold and Joudrey. 9s Sanborn tops Crum and ties March. 99 Brown downs Ganzel and Holliday. 102 Prazalk rips Rockmore 106 Yanis yerks Tweten and Winslow; Bostwick bests Van de Carr and Yanis. Tourneys 110-120: Hunt wits from Ensor: Cunningham withdrawn. 112 Jintz rips Rochel, 113 Dyba downs Itkin. 115 Mullison licks Long. 120 Van Gelder vips Rathvon.

## Started in 1965 (Key: 65-P)

Tourneys 1-32: 1 Londry downs Dunne. is Wellman replaces Daum. 11 Eatman replaces Barnes. 19 Hartenstein replaces MeGowan. 32 Dould ties Sayre but loses to Hall.

GOLDEN KNIGHTS
Progressive Qualification Championships
11th Annual Championship-1957 PLAYOFFS (Key: 57-Np)
Sections 1.2:1 Doe downs Smith.
13th Annual Championship-1959-60
FINALS (Key: 59-Nf)
Sections 1.32: 29 Capillon wins from Kogan. 31 Millette and Boucher defeat Curtiss, 32 Calingaert bows to Turbin but bests Harris: Crenshaw cracks Reed.

14th Annual Championship-1960-1 SEMI-FINALS (Key: 60-Ns)
Sections 1-80: 79 Gordon downs Setstrum.

## FINALS (Key: 60.Nf)

Sections 1-31: 14 Morris wins from Yerhoff. 18 Crown and Healy tie. 24 Hiderton halts Hardman. 26 Storm stops Tesel, 27 Valvo bests Blau. 30 Brown withdraws.

## 15th Annual Championship-1961-2

SEMI-FINALS (Key: 61-Ns)
Sections 1-95; 49 Lense licks Johnson; Ladacki tops (f) Waring. 69 Thumen cracks Crown. 74 Wilson whips Toller. 78 Batuer beats Westbrook. 82 Fisher halts Houston. \$5 Leonard withdrawn. 86 Buchanan bests Bradford. 87 Bellamy beats Roberts but bows to Shaw. 88 Culium tops (f) Maderer. 89 Rothe rips Pease. 90 House downs Anderson. 91 Akroyd, Schmidt, Matle and Covevou mob McGuire: Maille bests Bertram but bows to Covevou. 93 Li Peiri fells Fallier. 94 Williams toses to Hildreth and Dome and withdraws.

## FINALS (Key: 61-Nf)

Sections 1-29: 1 Meyer and Slavich tie. 7 Sonshine mauls Maier and Slater. 10 Strahan tops Taneri. 11 Dean loses to Beckham and ties Klein; Nusser nips Williams. 12 Peretti trips Travis; Bournias beats Shultis; Fontenrose fells Graetz. 13 Ellis loses to Slavich and ties Cook; Bock ties Cook and tops Popel; Cook, Glass tie. 14

Coveyou and Dundas conk Churchill; Coveyou ties Stephens and tops Dundas, 15 Dumont tops (a) Saint. 17 Bancroft bests Harrison and Kogan: Markiewicz beats Hubbatd. is Warren downs Dayton: Levine. Tutte tie. 23 Thomas tops McKaig. 24 Buczko tops (f) D'Angelis. 25 Smith smites Piche and Rogers: Freeman withdrawn. 20 Feriner tops (f) Orgusaar.

## 16th Annual Championship-1963

PRELIMINARY ROUND (Key: 63-N)
Sections 1.177: 75 Werner wins from Spessavd, 109 Criner and Hendricks crown Brown. Lis Williams withdrawn. 129 Bizar bests Layowski. 131 Werner licks Layton. 138 .Johnson wins (a) from Fournier and Stallknecht, 139 Fisher fells Melis. 153 McCormick and Phfllips tie. 154 Ashley, Hampton tie. 170 Buchanan ties Stesko and Dome; Dome, Stesko tie. 173 Rudelis rips Endrieks.

## SEMI-FINALS (Key: 63-N5)

Sections 1-34: 13 Grant takes Johnson. 15 Thomas tops Thompson. 16 Thorsen withdrawn, 17 Bostwick and Harris tie. 18 Beckham tops Bigler and ties Sarar: Pascheci withdrawn, 19 Reynolds withdraws. 23 Jasska and Kiefling smite Smithers: Browne conks Kiefling; Rich and Jaaska rip Regan; Stevenson ties Browne and Janski, 25 Olson axes Mcinnes; Kiff, Smith, Foster, Olson and Donins mob Mueller. 26 Moorhtad matuls Wendling. 29 Lach licks Aks. 30 Fearey bests Harnach but bows to Abrams. 81 Brandt pows Parr; Schwartz biffs Butler. 32 Stys stops McCaffrey: browne ties Tolins and tops Morrell. 33 Agulera rips Ross: Miles mauls Brandreth. 34 Bigler licks Ashley; Sonshine socks shepard.
Sections 35-40: 36 Zeroth wins from Hannold and Frank: May mauls Foglund and Frank. 37 Goodman bests Buzan and Holmdahl. 38 Graft Lies Pearlstein and Rosenberg: Etcher, Walloch tie; Pearlstein tops (f) Kawits. to Deines bows to Faivis and Soules and Lies Hayes. 41 Kohut and Laird tie. 43 Baron beats Buhrer. 44 Slavich stops Feldstein. 45 Greenberg bests Marks; Stevens beats Bullockus. 46 Burlingame rips Ross: Walker whips Ashley, 47 Brigmanis breaks Bland, is Abram rips Christianson and Marschall. 49 Arehbold and Wood crack Criner.
Sections 50-64; 52 Rosenberg wins from Heidel. 55 Starinkas downs Delman; Starinkas, Clark, Reilly and Delman mob Goff. 57 Dunkle downs Weinbers.

## FINALS (Key: 63-Nf)

Sections 1-8: 1 Mueller loses to Collins and ties Marklewicz; Katz mauls Markiewicz. If Perea conks Colter.

## 17th Annual Championship-1964

PRELIMINARY ROUND (Key: 64-N)
Sections 1-69; 3 Sullivan wins from Hallam. A Best tops (a) Gahagan, 9 Bishop licks Van Lith. 17 Taylor tops Hendry. 21 Pease conks Cohan. 22 Reynolds withdraws. 23 Buhrer. Helper tie. 26 Donins, Marshall tie. 33 Jrown bows to Dragonetti but bests Frank. 37 Custer rips Deines and Ramthun. 40 Van de Carr downs Haralson and Murray. 43 Bamman and Butland rout Ramer. 45 Feldman withdrawn. 51 Lapenna licks Brown. 52 Shreve spills Goodspeed. 54 Wren rips Simott. 55 Poliakoff trips Trone: Young yerks Shively. 56 Ozols bests Hubbard and Fatmman. 57 Grant rips Rufer. 59 Dulicai downs Burbank and Good: Grant takes Good. 63 Reichard licks Malsby but loses to Greifer and 1tkin. 64 Caudill bows to Coubhourn and ties Moody. 65 Ronan licks Lieberman. 66 Moncharsh hips Newitt. 67 Colbow, Wright tie. 69 Coveyou axes Itkin. Sections 70-89: 70 Cole conks Mosig. 71 Westbrook jolts Jackson: Willis whips Benton and Westbrook. 72 Stern tops (a) spat\%. 73 Ward whips MeCormick and Knight: Howell nips K゙night and Burns. 74 Mcelroy routs Alonso. Gildea and Larrabee. 76 Birns bests Volkman. Moore and Goldberg; Lliso licks Moore; Stabler tops Alex-
ander and thes Birns. 78 Karli clips Kline. So Rivera rips Lamelere: Stevenson stops Shafran. St Ballard bests West. 82 Kwartler quells Latemina. \$4 Larzelere and Burton heat Yevuta, 85 McCormick bows to Bland but hests Freider: Luprecht ties Bernero and loses to Bland. 85 Clay clips Scranton, \&i Gordon downs Lauderdale. S8 Rosenherg routs l'angborn and Kersula, s 9 Domann downs Johnson.
Sections 90-109: 90 Henderson halts Hyde: Hamff withdraws, loses (a) to Cannon. 91 Hendricks licks Lee, 92 Cavanaugh ties Itkin and lops Darton. 93 Keiser conks Herbst, 94 KcKaig conks Marshall. 95 Prazak licks Lane and Beadix but loses to Herrick: Lerner bests Bendix but bows to Herrick and Voker; Warren withdraws: Voker heats Bendix. 96 Crutchley Joses to Solot and ties Lavingston; Pirone bests Williams but bows to solot. 98 Aberts beats Cassill. too Moore mats Nicoletti: Lacey licks Gettelson. 101 Siegel, Dunkle. Ratuch and batter Jatr Johnson. 102 Makaitis matuls Malkin: Mooney halts Hall. 103 Hodak and Hall dowa Brown: Hall licks Wilcox but loses to Levine. 104 Musgrove and Harnach beat Burk. 105 Horwitz loses to Feuquay, withdraws and drops (a) to Beesley. 106 Taylor bests Genens but bows to Barrick; Westhrook and Taytor iop Peterson. 107 Murphy and Goltesman manl Conway: Penniston downs Freedman, Van de Carr, Murphy and Conway. 10 S Weir withdraws. 103 Moyer mauls Halt; Dryfoos and Stern stop Crum.
Sections 110.129: 110 Parrish withdrawn. 111 Lams socks Samuel: Mathews lfcks Moody but loses to Vaickus; Jepson. Moody tie. 112 Bischotf smears Smart and Wright. 113 DeVore conks carpenter. 114 Cunningham withdrawn. 116 Webb whips Schuller. 117 Greenhers tops (f) Schwab. 118 Pickard and (. Smith lick Lyne: Jamison ties C. smith. tops Lyne and loses to Churchill. 119 Sherr nips Sagle: Zegar withdrawn. 121 Grayson licks Walmisley: Gibbs whips Willis: Baxevanidis wihdrawn. 123 Werner downs Diekhalls. 124 Graves bows to Howard but bests Dean: Lansenfeld lieks Chobot and Jean 125 Christman loses to Campbeli but licks Cnomo. 128 Cayiord stops Stephan and Meyer. 129 Zalys tops Terry; Terry and Landey ax Einstein.
Sections 130-151: 130 Connell wins from Gentry; Boldt Jars Jeans. 131 Scherrer licks Ashley, 132 Horne trips Traube; Shipley stops Trauhe and Stephens. 133 Carson conks Vakes: Hornstein tops (f) Wantland, 134 Wennerstrom whips Petersen. 135 Rudd withdraws: Miller stops Einstein. 137 Greene conks Keiser and Smithers. 138 Ashley licks Waffle. 139 Mounier bests Burt: Pugh withdrawn. 110 Hildreth licks Levin; Joyce jars Thomas. 141 Eisle and Stayart whip Greenwood. 142 M:mtell and Weinkauf maul Zinck: Dowdell downs Mantell. 143 Gordon downs Egan: Hail hatis Zinck. It Damiels tops Martin. 145 Kochler tops (f) Salter. 14s Crum lops Rogers and ties Thompson; Dill withdraws. 149 Lowh licks von Saleski 151 Lane licks Langer; Crowder downs Cunum.

## SEMI-FINALS (Key; 64-Ns)

Sections 1-24: 2 May mauls Abrams: Abrams. Neff rip Mott. I Sandstrom. Va: Brunt and Peek hit Hall, 5 Kramer eracks Brand: Hendricks drubs Hogliand. 7 Smith smites Kramer and Vaitkus; Lenz licks Wipper. \& Agullera bests Browne and bows to Pipher. 9 Goodman ties Maillard and tops Stern: Dreibergs drubs Stayart. 11 Rader withdraws. 12 Ozols nips Weininger. 17 Kent downs MeDonald; D'Aoust withdraws. 22 Levy replaces Goodspeed.

## 18th Annual Championship-1965

PRELIMINARY ROUND (Key: 65-N)
Sections 1-59; 1 Vitles jars Jachimowic\%. 2 Bender tops Nickel and ties Carpenter. 3 Gross bests Bender and Carpenter; Tileston tops Scranton. A Anders bows to Bettencourt but bests Floldcroit. \& Rader withdraws. 7 Freelander licks Thomas. 8 Folkes Rute tie. 19 Lane licks Tyson. 20 Young-
quist quells Levy. 24 Smidchens smites Schwer: Bowling downs Dudek, 25 Goodspeed loses to Hoglund and withdraws. 2if Dunham downs Oursler. 31 Faivus $t$ ells Horne. 38 Gancher and Capper chon Witlin. 39 Scherff licks Van Lith: Barra conks Kelso. 41 Kent beats Gibbons. 42 Susswein halts Helper 49 Beningoso mauls Merkel. 31 Johnson jars Chase. 53 Carpenter whips Wilson. 56 Chiesa replaces Aguilera. 59 Phythyon whips Wojtowiez.
Sections 60-96: 60 Duykers replaces HagKett. 62 Casey downs Anderson. 65 Smither: replaces Wakely. 67 Moan mauls Worden. 6s Copeland tops (f) Forrest. is stayart replaces Novick. 81 Butiand replaces Dickinson.

## NEW POSTALITES

The following new Postal Chess players began in March with these ratings:
CLASS A at 1300: R. Anderson, D. Friend, R. Gidew, IS. G, Ingalls, H. James, R. D. Jones and W. E. Jordan:
CLASS B at 1200: B, Burgstahier. 1. J. Coplin. L. B. Fatheree. R. Feuerstein. Myrl R. Hansen, I, Hirschman, J. J. Kawesko. S. F. Kinney. B. Laney, H. Larrondo. H. Lieberman. A. H. Lumpkin, R. F. McKay. S. Nitrkinsky, A. R. Plutzik. B, Riley, S. Rothman, J, F, Sorahan, R. Sparrow. R, F. Wurster and M. Zavanelli:
CLASS C at 900: N. H. Abrahameon, R, Adams, K. A. Anderson, E. L. Bartolini, G, S. Benmer, J. Boggi, K. J. Brockman, F. G. Brown. N. Charney, C. T. Chieffo, R, E. Chiesa, M. Connolly, J. Corthell, B. W. Daniels. W. Rollbaum. M. Ellis. C. Gatles, E: Heaney, W. Fogendyk. A. C. Folmberg. IB. Leonard, C, H. Lion, J. F. Long, D. Lymn, K. Macduff. L. G. Margulis. A. Mass. R. MoCoubrey. B. McDowell. J. Milden, J. Monroe. A. E. Morgan. B. Nalepa, M. Newman. L. T. Niemi, F. E. Noel, P. D. Orem, D. G. Paulowich, W. Perry, N. I. Presley. C. Reedy. M. P. E. Ribner. G. B. Sanders. R. F. Savage. R. A. Searles. J. M. Sipples. B. A. Skosen. A. Sonneborn. S. D. Staton, R. E. Steck. S. Steckoll. M. H. Steinberg. R. R. Sullivan, Myrtle T. Tertel, M. Ward, Mary Welsh and R. Yanalavage:
CLASS D at 600: C. Anderson, R, L. Bender, W. R. Bolin, B. D. Bonner, L. K. Brainard, B. Brown. D. Carter, R. Cavallaro. Joyce A. Chlesa, D. F. Clausing, R. Cook. S. A. Cook. J. C. Cuthbertson, M. Fasiocco, H. H. Gilbert, R. Grahe, L. Grimm, D. R. Hahn, T. A. Haltigan, I. Harrison. Mr. D. Harrison. R Huber, N. E. Jacobs. P. M. Jeans. D. G. Kanaaki, F Kennedy. M, Iaskin, L. M. Levy, I. McCoubrey. Miss S. McCoy. M. J. Monaco, I. Nadon. M. Page. S. Ratcliff. H. J. Rucker, H. Ruiz, R. E. Sev. erson. J. J. Siegel, Ruth Spooner, F, C. Stores, D. Sturtevant, B, Sullivan, D. Villeneme and R. A. Vogel.

## RETURN POSTS

The following old timers returted during March at these former ratings:
J. 15, Aptt 538 ; M. Hyvarinen 1334; T. H. Messengale 1056; J. $P$ Nielsen 1096; D. Royalty 600; C. L. Ryhlen 760: and W. E. Young 738.

CHESS and CHECKERS Supplies
High Quality Catalin and Plastic Checkers Plain or Grooved . . All Sizes
CHESS Sets . . . Wood . . Catalln . . Plastic All Sizes . . All Prices CHESS and CHECKER Boards Folding, Non-Folding, Regulation or Numbered
CHESS.CHECKER Timing Clocks
All Merchandise Reasonably Priced SEND FOR FREE CATALOG STARR SPECIALTY COMPANY 1529 South Noble Road,
Cleveland Helghts, Ohlo $\mathbf{4 4 1 2 1}$

## CHESS BY MAIL

If you have not played in our tourneys before, please specify in which class you would like to start. We recommend Class A for unusually strong players, Class $B$ for above average players, Class C for about average players and Class $D$ for below average. If you have played, please state your probable rating.
Mail proper entry coupon below, or copy of it, to CHESS REVIEW, 134 Weat 72d Street, New York, N. Y. 10023.

## CLASS TOURNAMENT

Start playing chess by mail NOW: Enter one of the 4 man groups.
You will be assigned to a section with 3 other players about equal to yourself in playing skill. You play both White and Black against the other three. You play all six games simultaneously, two games on one set of postcards.
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## POSTAL GAMES trom CHESS REVIEW tourneys

Our Postal players are invited to submit their BEST games for this department. The moves of each game must be written on a standard score sheet, or typed on a single sheet of paper, and mark. ed "for publica. tion"

## Annotated by JOHN W. COLLINS

## POSTAL CHESS CAVIAR

This department presents a page of short shorts, the pungent relish of chess. The quality cannot be too high in such, though the excitement usually is; so the commentary is condensed. If and when supply permits-for true short shorts are rather rare-perhaps, we'll have another such page.

## FRENCH DEFENSE

Dr. Tarrasch spoke of a game similar to this one as a " $\mathrm{BxP} \dagger, \mathrm{KxB}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 5 \dagger$ and wins, hooray!" type of game.

| F. W. Hoglund |  | P. Goodspeed |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White |  |  |  | Black |
| 1 P-K4 | P-K3 | 7 | B-Q3 | O-O? |
| $2 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | P-Q4 | 8 | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{RP} \mathrm{\dagger}$ ! | K-R1 |
| 3 P-Q4 | N-KB3 | 9 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 5$ | P-KN3 |
| 4 P-K5 | KN-Q2 | 10 | Q-N4! | NXQP? |
| 5 P -B4 | B-N5 | 11 | BxP | K-N2 |
| $6 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | N -QB3 | 12 | B-R7 | Resigns |

## BLACKMAR-DIEMER GAMBIT

Here the climax is an announced mate in five beginning with $13 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5$ : e.g. 13 .. P-KR3 14 Q-N6, RPxN $15 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 5$, R-B2 16 Q-R7ヶ, K-B1 17 Q-R8 mate.

## G. Stayart

R. W. Peacock

| 1 | $P-Q 4$ | N-KB3 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 2 | $P-K B 3$ | $P-Q 4$ |
| 3 | $P-K 4$ | $P \times P$ |
| 4 | $N-B 3$ | $P \times P$ |
| 5 | $Q \times P$ | $P-K 3$ |
| 6 | $B-Q 3$ | $N-Q B 3$ |

## SICILIAN DEFENSE

Because a Pawn down, Black feels he must avoid exchanging Queens-only to promptly lose Her Dark Majesty.
G.
10 P
2 P
3
4
4
5
5
6
7
7
8

| 1 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB4} 4$ | 9 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{QB4} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ ? |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 2 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $10 \mathrm{~N} / 4-\mathrm{N} 5$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 1$ |  |
| 3 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | 11 | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{R} 4$ ? |
| 4 | $\mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | 12 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | $\mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{B} \dagger$ |
| 5 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | 13 | $\mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ |
| 6 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KN} 3$ | $14 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}$ |  |
| 7 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | 15 | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4$ ? |
| 8 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | 16 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 6!$ | Resigns |

For the Queen goes after $16 \ldots$ Q-R8 $17 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{QxP} 18 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QN} 1$.

PONZIANI OPENING
This game was adjudicated a win for Black; for he wins after 16 R-K1, Q-B3 17 Q-B3, QxP

| C. P. Sai |  | P. J. Dumont |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | P-K4 | 8 | Q×B | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| 2 N-KB3 | N-QB3 | 9 | Q-K2 | B-Q3 |
| $3 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B3}$ | P-Q4 | 10 | P-QB4 | Q-K4 |
| $4 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5$ ? | PxP | 11 | P-Q3 | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| 5 NxP | Q-Q4 | 12 | PxP | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $6 \mathrm{BxN}+$ | PxB | 13 | P-QR3 | KR-K1 |
| $7 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 4$ ? | BXN | 14 | B-K3 |  |



IRREGULAR QUEEN PAWN OPENING
After bizarre play on both sides, White snaps up a Pawn, and his King proves to be in a cul-de-sacrifice neatly set up by Black.


## SICILIAN DEFENSE

An ingenious and unusual sacrifice of the King Pawn leads to a precise winning attack on the Queen file.

| J. Cole |  |  | D. E, | Wilson |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 P-K4 | P-QB4 | 8 | B-K3 | B-N5 |
| $2 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB3}$ | N-QB3 | 9 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{R} 4$ | B-Q3 |
| P-Q4 | PxP | 10 | P-KN3! | NxP ? |
| 4 NxP | P-K3 | 11 | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}$ | QP×N |
| $5 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | P-QR3 | 12 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 6$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 1$ |
| 6 B-K2 | Q-B2 | 13 | Q-Q4 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| $70-0$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | 14 | N-B4 | K-K2? |

On principle, 14 . . . B-K2 seems safer, Note that, on $16 \ldots$ P-KR3, in-
stead of $16 \ldots \mathrm{BxP}$, White has 17 NxB , RxN 18 B-B5 etc.
15 QR-Q1 R-Q1 18 R×R P-QN4 16 Q-R4 B×P $19 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 5 \dagger \quad \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 1$ $17 \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{B} \quad \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} \quad 20 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 6 \dagger$ Resigns

Because of 20 . . . K any 21 NxNPs.

## VIENNA GAME

While this game is not in Weaver $W$. Adams' version of the Vienna, it is a Vienna. White gets surprisingly good play till Black cracks under pressure.
G. B. Dunham
C. J. Hendricks

| 1 | P-K4 | P-K4 | 11 | Q-R4†! | N-B3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | N-QB3 | N-KB3 | 12 | B×P | Q-Q3 |
| 3 | P-KN3 | P-Q4 | 13 | B-R3 | Q-B3 |
| 4 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | 14 | O-O | B-Q2 |
| 5 | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}$ | 15 | QR-N1 | N-K4 |
| 6 | $\mathrm{NP} \times \mathrm{N}$ | B-QB4 | 16 | Q-N4 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B6}+$ ? |
| 7 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | P-K5? | 17 | $B \times N$ | P-QR4 |
| 8 | N-Q4! | $B \times N$ ? | 18 | QxNP | R-QB1 |
| 9 | P×B | QxP | 19 | KR-K1 $\dagger$ |  |
| 10 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | Q-Q6 |  |  | Resigns |

## COLLE SYSTEM

White tops off fine opening play and a temporary piece sacrifice with the final threat of a smothered mate.

| A. F. Woods | F. Ashley |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | P-Q4 | N-KB3 |  | 10 |

## IRREGULAR QUEEN PAWN OPENING

White gains nothing by taking the King Bishop Pawn, but Black's mere threat to take the Queen Bishop Pawn, by 21 . . . BxBP, forces resignation.

| J. | Stonkus |  |  |  | H. Ploss |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | P-Q4 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{KB3}$ | 11 | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| 2 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{KB3}$ | P-KN3 | 12 | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N} \dagger$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N}$ |
| 3 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | P-Q4 | 13 | Q-B3 | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ |
| 4 | B-B4 | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | 14 | B-B4 | QxBP |
| 5 | P-K3 | O-0 | 15 | PxP | P×P |
| 6 | P-KR3 | P-B4 | 16 | O-O-O | B-B4 |
| 7 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | Q N-Q2 | 17 | Q×P | P-Q6! |
| 8 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | P-K4 | 18 | P-QB3 | QR-N1 |
| 9 | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{KN} 5$ | P-Q5 | 19 | $\mathrm{BxP} \dagger$ | K-R1 |
| 10 | N/3-K4 | Q-R4 | 20 | Q-Q5 | Q-B2 |
|  |  |  |  | Resigns |  |
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# CHESS ON THE COMPUTER 

By DR. M. Euwe and W. J. Muhring

## Part I. - CHESS BY MACHINE

The idea of a chess-playing machine is very old. Nearly every one knows the story of Baron von Kempelen who, about 200 years ago, astonished all Europe and particularly royal circles, by exhibiting a chess-playing machine of great skill.' The machine nearly always won, and the admiration over this wonder of technical ingenuity was great and general, until the secret of the machine was exposed. It appeared that a person of small stature but with a large share of chess brains was hidden in the machine. The disappointment over this hoax, however, was not such that the idea of a chess machine was abandoned. The technical knowhow was simply too limited.

In later years, new attempts were undertaken, usually without success. Apparently, man was reaching too high.
Then the Spaniard Quevedo in the '20's worked on a more modest basis. He limited himself to a small but sharply restricted part of the game: the endgame of King and Rook versus King. He constructed a machine which executed the mating operation entirely correctly. It forced mate from any closen position, within fifty moves. Quevedo's machine worked with relays and other electrical gadgets. Still, it did not deserve the name of electronic computer.
The computer entered the field about ten years ago when Prof. Van der Poel of Delfi, Holland, compiled a chess program for the PTERA, a small machine developed in the Neher Laboratory in Leiden. Like his Spanish forerunner, Prof. Van der Poel limited himself to the King and Rook versus King endgame. This choice is not arbitrary. Treatment of this ending has its fixed rules both as concerns the driving of the King to the edge of the board and as concerns the mating operation.
This sharply defined method, called algorhythm, can be converted without any serious trouble into instructions for the machine. So the programming was relatively easy. It should be realized that the program should be such that it applies to any and all positions of King and Rook versus King. Once the program has been introduced into the computer, further action is excluded - except of course for the making of the counter move. The latter action can be accomplished, for example, by informing the computer via a punchcard of the counter move by its opponent.
This procedure may seem puzzling to the layman; but, for the operator of the computer, it is very simple: all that which

[^9]can be sharply defined can be programmed and is then executed by the machine.

Of what does such a program consist? It is a continuity of questions which, depending on the answer to each, is followed by a new question or by some instruction. For example, does the enemy King stand four rows from the edge of the board? If yes, move the Rook onto the fifth row so the King cannot escape. Is the Rook already on the fifth row, then move the King toward the opponent's King, preferably so the Kings are at a Knight's move distance from each other. Is the enemy King not four rows from the edge, is the distance, perhaps, three? etc.

Determination of the instruction (which defines the move) must take all situations into account. When such has been done, the task is completed, for this single position is the arbitrary position which represents all possible positions. It is as in solving a square root equation. As long as the co-efficients are figures, only one specific equation is solved, and no other. But, after working out one example with letter co-efficients, all square root equations are solved, save for some very exceptional cases.

This small deviation is important for the subject of "Chess by Machine." A fundamental difference must be recog. nized between positions, on the one hand, which can be treated in accordance with fixed rules, that is, by algorhythm, and, on the other hand, positions for which such is not true.

Inasmuch as most chess positions belong to the second category, that is, they lack algorhythm, the programming of the King and Rook versus King ending has not really brought the problem of chess by machine nearer to its solution.

During the last fifteen years, extensive investigations have been made regard. ing not just a part of the game of chess but regarding the game in its entirety. The first push in that direction was made
by Claude Shannon, who in a remarkable article published in 1950 posed the problems critically and suggested possibilities of approach. Some of his ideas were and still are the basis for continuing investigations in this field.

It is perhaps well to assume that the point is not chess as such, but the question to what extent a chess programming can imitate human thinking and thereby contribute to the understanding of the process thereof.
The computer is then the powerful means by which the correctness of that thinking process can be tested quickly and efficiently.

Interest in this problem is of primary concern to the psychologist. Hence, a much broader field has been developed in circles which deal daily with human thinking, particularly in reference to the making of decisions.

The manager of a concern, when he has to make a decision, takes all kinds of considerations into account. He acts much like a chessplayer who is choosing his next move. A manufacturer buying materials will consult his statistics, will recall decisions of the past, that is, consult his experience, will also check out the consequences of given choices, step by step, and, ultimately, will make his decision, perhaps entirely by intuition. So, too, the chessplayer consults books, judges the situation as a whole using, consciously or subconsciously, his experience (strategy) and also calculates, move by move, the consequences of a number of obvious possibilities (tactics and combination) and lastly also uses his intui. tion.

Neither the manufacturer nor the chessplayer follows a fixed pattern. While thinking and combining, they often move helter-skelter in the hope of finding an inspiration for their choice. Thus, the decision cannot be attained by following fixed rules. This is called the neuristic approach, a probing left and right, which sometimes leads to results but does not guarantee success.

It does not follow that the determination of a chess move cannot occur in part algorhythmically. The thought process of a chessplayer will contain, depending on the position but even more so on his character and temperament, a smaller or larger percentage of algorhythmic elements. Former world champion Tahl is the perfect heurist. Euwe, at least in his books, favors algorhythm. In doing so, he follows Steinitz and Lasker who preached constantly that the move to be chosen, the plan to be used have to be in accord
with the characteristics of the position. Therefore, these three former world champions tried at all times to make the choice of move a matter of algorhythm, a method whereby procedure is derived from the characteristics of the position and ultimately, so, is the choice of the move itself.

To return to the Shannon article, the first, the least important part is devoted to the progamming of the basic chess moves and the playing rules. After solving this relatively simple problem, Shannon demonstrated that it is theoretically possible to play a perfect chess game but that this task exceeds by far the capability of even the most modern computer. On each move in a game, the opponent can re-act generally with a great number of answers. On every counter move, a great number of reply moves are possible. And the consequence is an ever-increasing network of branches, technically in computer parlance called a "tree." Starting with the first branching, say, into ten (which is conservative), each branch may subdivide into ten and again into ten, and so on. Such a tree of all possibilities is practically unlimited in width and depth. And complete analysis of the variations which may flow from one single position is beyond the ability both of the chessplayer and of the machine. The total number of possibilities in a given middle game position was estimated by Shannon to be of the order of 1 followed by 120 zeros!
To come to practical results, it is necessary to limit the width of the tree to just the most important possibilities and to restrict the depth to four or five moves. That is, the tree of all legal moves must be trimmed both in width and in depth.

For this purpose, stated Shannon, it is necessary to develop some kind of an evaluating stick which can indicate the value of a position. Shannon visualized a numerical measuring stick to be applied to the several positions, ranging from "absolutely won" through such gradations as "favorable," "equal" and "unfavorable" to "completely lost." Shannon further introduced the conception of a "stop rule" - to determine at which moment (or level) examination of a branch must be terminated. For instance, it may be possible that the preponderance for one side is over-obvious - the human chessplayer would not go beyond that point either or that a situation of quiescence has been attained, which enhances the reliability of evaluation by the measuring stick or, finally, the "stop" may be "legislated" for a pre-determined level of depth, for example, no more than five moves ahead.

If a perfect evaluating stick could be devised, it would not be necessary to go deeper than one move in advance. Determination of the best move then would turn simply to that move which leads to
the position with the highest evaluation. But, of course, the perfect evaluation device is impossible. There are many factors which determine the value of a position, and these factors differ in significance in various kinds of positions.
With a depth of only a few moves, however, and with evaluation of the end position only, it is hoped that the inaccuracy of the measuring stick may be somewhat corrected.

Even so, Shannon pointed out, a new problem arises: it is no longer certain then that the move leading to the highest evaluation is sure to be chosen. It is quite possible that maximum evaluation can be reached only with the co-operation of the opponent, something on which no actual chessplayer may rely. Distinction must be made, therefore, between branches under control and branches which depend on decisions made by the opponent. It is important to reach the position with the highest evaluation which can be obtained against the best continuation by the opponent.
The procedure which, with a given measuring stick, thus leads to a definite choice of moves is called minimax procedure. It is the procedure which every chessplayer follows, consciously or subconsciously. It can best be clarified with an example.


Here White is considering the moves $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R} 66^{\prime}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 2$ and $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 4$. The replies which Black can make and the counter replies thereafter by White are shown in the tree (only a little tree) represented
by the table at the bottom of the page. The resulting end positions there are appraised numerically by the use of a definite measuring stick.

This example is not truly one of the manner in which a computer works or could work. It is offered merely by way of explaining the minimax procedure. (To simplify presentation, the three branches of the tree are shown separately: follow them along with the ensuing discussion).

In order to derive the correct move from this rather simple little tree, we proceed as follows.

Start with the first branch and White's second move. On $1 \ldots$ KxB, White has the choice of three continuations and, of course, picks that with the highest evaluation: i.e. $2 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 7 \grave{( }(+40)$. Hence, we can likewise ascribe $(+40)$ to $1 \ldots \mathrm{KxB}$, meaning that the position after 1 . . . KxB is worth that to White. We must always assume that the best move is made, in this instance, $2 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 7 \%$. In the same manner, $1 \ldots \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Rl}$ is appraised $(+70) ; 1 \ldots$ K-B3 (0); and $1 \ldots$ K-N1 ( -5 ). Each time, the highest number is taken from the group of White's counter replies corresponding to Black's reply.

Now the question is which is Black's best move after 1 B-R $6 \dagger$. He has the choice of four moves, each with the position appraisals just given. And he, of course, picks the move with the smallest appraised value as the most advantageous for him, or the least disadvantageous. So he picks $1 \ldots \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1$ appraised as -5 . The practical consequence then is that White's 1 $B-R 6 \dagger$ has that same evaluation of -5 and is a bit disadvantageous for White.

In this manner then, the smallest and largest values are picked out. Hence, we have the procedural name: mini-max.
Similarly, White's other two moves result in $1 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 2(+5)$ and $1 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 4(-5)$. And the conclusion can be drawn that 1 Q-N2 is the best move, and the high values which might follow 1 B-R6ث must be disregarded for the final choice.

## 1st Branch

## 1 B-R6 ${ }^{\dagger}$



## 2nd Branch

1 - N 2

| 1...Q-Q4 |  | $11 . . . \mathrm{K}$ |  | $11 . . . N-$ |  | $1 \ldots$ R- |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2 \mathrm{~N} \cdot \mathrm{B3}+ \\ +30 \end{gathered}$ | $2 \mathrm{P}_{0} \mathrm{K4}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 Q \times R \\ +5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \mathrm{~N} \cdot \mathrm{~B} 4 \\ -10 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 Q \times R \\ +5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 4 \\ -10 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \mathrm{~N} . \mathrm{B4t} \\ +50 \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{-5}{2 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 7 \dagger}$ |

3rd Branch
1 N-B4

| $1 . . . Q-Q 4 \dagger$ |  | 1. . . Q-B3 $\dagger$ |  |  | 1 . . Q-Q6 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2 P_{0}{ }_{0}^{K 4}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2 \mathrm{P} .83 \\ -10 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \text { P. K } 4 \\ & -10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2.P.B3 } \\ -5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N}_{1} \\ -5 \end{gathered}$ | $2 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 2 \dagger$ | $\underset{-2}{2 \times \mathrm{Q}}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  | Chess review, MAY, 1965 |  |

The minimax procedure follows fixed rules, provided of course that there is available a reliable measuring stick for evaluating positions. When such is the case, programming for computer use is no longer a problem. The computer would choose 1 Q-N2, and the process described would be repeated after the computer was told of Black's reply.
Although the minimax procedure has apparently brought the problem of chess by machine a bit closer to solution, there still remain difficulties, already pointed out by Shannon. Each system of evaluation has a static character, and it is almost meaningless to evaluate a position in the middle of a combination. Assume, for instance, White has sacrificed his Queen but will regain it in three moves or effect mate. During this combination, evaluation of the intermediate positions may show an advantage for Black because he is a Queen up. Similarly, every static system of evaluation must fail when the evolving position involves capturing moves, checks, mating attacks and so on. Consequently, evaluation should be undertaken only when a definite degree of stabilization has been reached.

Shannon pointed out another objection. If all possible moves and every legal answer and all counter answers etc. must be examined, the machine would waste a great deal of time in registering completely unimportant variations, that is, those which ought to have no proper part in the evaluation. The example offered above was restricted to the most suitable replies and yet contained a good deal of unnecessary work. So Shannon desired to select from all the possible moves a select group for which examination is worthwhile. Decision as to which moves fall within or without that group depends on all kinds of criteria. As a rule, capturing moves, checks and threats will belong in the privileged group; passive and senseless moves would never be included.
Here, however, another weak spot appears. The machine can determine if a move is a checking move or a threat, but how can it determine if a move is passive or purposeless? And what will the machine do with that great group of quiet continuations? Shannon's successors have not been able to answer these questions, and it is believed that they will remain unanswered for a long time to come.
The crucial problem of programming at present is: how to trim the branches in depth and even more particularly in width.
Prof. A. D. de Groot seeks solution in the following direction. First of all, the target position which the player has or should have in mind must be determined. When it is known, the infinite series of possible moves shrinks to a few lines of
action. Moreover, the more specific the target position the easier it is to reject all which is not helpful in attaining that position.
The Carnegie-Rand group (Newell, Shaw and Simon) mention a number of sub-target positions. These are of particular importance for the opening and for the first phases of the middle game. They run to such features as control of the center, promotion of development, king safety and so on. The program examines only those moves which contribute to the characteristics mentioned. And the result is, at any rate, a substantial trimming of the tree. With such rules, however, such moves as K-K2 in the Steinitz Gambit ${ }^{2}$ would never be produced.
Prof. de Groot points out a threefold economy in the target position. First, all moves which do not contribute are summarily eliminated. Second, a move which contributes to attaining the target position may still be rejected when one of the replies makes such attainment im. possible. Third, there is the possibility of terminating the examination upon determination that the target position cannot be brought sufficiently nearer by one single move.
To clarify the last point, assume White wants to sacrifice a Rook, and the machine is to examine all possible consequences down to stable conclusions. If, in one of the branches and in an otherwise quiet position, it is determined that White is able to capture only a Bishop,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 21 \text { P-K4, P-K4 } 2 \text { N-QB3. N-Q13 } 3 \text { P-BH, } \\
& \mathrm{PxP}+\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4 . \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5+5 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2 .
\end{aligned}
$$


"Now don't make it too good. I don't want to pay four million dollars for a chess opponent that wins all the time!"
then the examination of that branch can be terminated. Such positions are technically termed "exhausted." On the other hand, if White in the critical position is able to attack the opponent's Queen or give check, then the examination may not be discontinued until it is quite clear that these attacks give no results. In this respect, the machine must be able to obtain certainty.

Here is a resume of the important points of Part I.

1 Examination of all possible moves is beyond the capability of the machine: the tree has too many branches. Several scientists have proposed worthwhile means of trimming the tree and so brought the problem nearer to a solution.
2 In the investigations, distinction must be made between algorhythmic and heuristic procedures. The former goes by fixed rules; the latter involves meaning. ful, reasoned trial and error.
3 In nearly all investigations, a meas. uring stick must be employed for evaluating possible comparisons and weighing of alternatives.
4 Use of such a system of evaluating implies the application of the minimax procedure to determine the best move.
After this general introduction, an article is to follow devoted to the "Euratom" investigation. This investigation was made on behalf of the Euratom in Brussels, Belgium, at the Foundation for Administrative Automatisation in Am. sterdam. Holland, between April 1, 1961 and April 1, 1963.

## In the Tradition!

All the world champions have dropped quickies-we think-one time or another. Champion Petrosyan joins the conformists in this game.

We find it recorded in the chess column of Fred Chevalier in the Christian Science Monitor as from the Championship of the Professional Unions, Moscow. December 1964-won by Petrosyan.

FRENCH DEFENSE

| Liberson |  | Petrosyan |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White |  |  |  | Black |
| 1 P-K4 | P-K3 | 8 | P-KR4 | P-KR4 |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | P-Q4 | 9 | Q-N3 | Q-R4 |
| $3 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | B-N5 | 10 | B-Q2 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B3}$ |
| $4 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$ | N-K2 | 11 | B-Q3 | QN-K2 |
| 5 P-QR3 | BxNt | 12 | P×P | QxP/4 |
| 6 PxB | P-QB4 | 13 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | B-Q2 |
| 7 Q-N4 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | 14 | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | B-N4 |

Black's game is uncomfortable, and he wants to rid himself of the effect of White's King Bishop, but his move is a blunder.

$$
15 \text { B-K3 Resigns }
$$

On $15 .$. Q-B3 16 N-Q4, Black loses a piece; but resignation seems drastic as some fight remains after $15 \ldots$ P-Q5 despite the Pawn minus and poor position which Black acquires.


Miniature games are the hors d'oeuvres of chess.

## USSR Championship 1960 Semi-finals

Truly, in this game white sacrifices his opponent's pieces.

## SICILIAN DEFENSE

| Bagirov |  | Movshovich |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White |  |  |  | Black |
| 1 P -K4 | P-QB4 | 4 | NxP | N-KB3 |
| $2 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | P-Q3 | 5 | N-QB3 | P-K3 |
| 3 P-Q4 | $P \times P$ | 6 | P-KN4 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ ? |
|  |  | 7 | N-B5 |  |

First $7 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5 \uparrow, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 28 \mathrm{BxB}+$ is slightly more accurate.
$7 \ldots$ P-KR4
$9 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} \quad \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N}$ 8 B-KN5 B-K3? $\begin{array}{lll}10 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} & \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 2 \\ & & 11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 6 \\ & \ldots .\end{array}$

White returns the Pawn to consolidate his positional advantage.

| $11 \ldots$ | P×P |
| :--- | :--- |
| 12 B×N | B×B |
| 13 N-K4 | $\ldots$ |



Black's in trouble also on 13 . . . B-K2 $14 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6, \mathrm{BxP} 15 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 216 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ or $13 \ldots \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} 14 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 4 \dagger$ and $15 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ or $13 \ldots \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 214 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ and $15 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$.
$14 Q \times P$
O-O
14... QxQ sacrifices Black's Bishop; 14 ... N-B3 loses most leisurely: 15 $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 5, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} 16 \mathrm{BxN}, \mathrm{PxB} 17$ QxBP etc. 15 Q×NP Resigns
Black's Rook is sacrificed: e.g. 15 . . . N-Q2 16 QxN etc.

## Moscow 1960

Black demonstrates how to lose in the opening without really trying.

QUEEN GAMBIT

Shmatkov
White

| 1 P-Q4 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q4}$ | $4 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB4}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $5 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{KB3}$ |  |
| 3 P-K3 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4!$ | $6 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |  |
|  |  |  | $7 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{QN}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |

Naturally, 7 . . . O-O is correct. Comparatively strong now is (8) . . . Resigns.

[^10]
$\varepsilon \mathrm{BxPt}!$
$K \times B$
8... K-B1 9 Q -N 3 ! loses for Black. $9 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5 \dagger \quad \mathrm{~K} \dagger$ N3
9 ... K-K1 or K-B1 $10 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 6(\dagger)$ and 9 .., K-N1 $10 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 3 \div$ lose at once.
10 Q-Q3 $\dagger$
K-R4

11 Q-R3 $\dagger$
....
Patience! Think it out, White!

| $11 . .$. | K-N3 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 12 Q-Q3 $\dagger$ | K-R4 |
| 13 N-K6 | Resigns |

Black's Queen goes, or 14 Q-B5t, and mate follows; or, finally, 13 . . Q-N1 $14 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 4 \dot{\mathrm{Y}}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 515 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3 \uparrow$, K-N5 16 P-R3 $7, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 417 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 6 \mathrm{~s}$ and mate next.

## Club Match, Perm (USSR) 1961

The proverbial Pawn-grab (7 NxP?) is severely punished.

SICILIAN DEFENSE

Rekka
White
Bobrinsky
$\begin{array}{llll}1 \text { P-K4 } & \text { P-QB4 } & 3 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q4} & \mathrm{PxP} \\ 2 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB3} & \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 3 & 4 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{P} & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4 \\ & & 5 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3 & \mathrm{~N}\end{array}$
4...N-B3 is correct, and White misses his best here: $5 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 36$ QN-B3.

| $5 . .$. | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $7 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B3}$ | $\mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{P}$ ? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $6 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{KN} 5$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $8 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
|  |  | $9 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 6 \dagger$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |

9 ... K-B1 $10 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ is fatal for Black; but he has no adequate defense at best.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 10 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4 \\
& 11 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 5 \dagger \text { ! }
\end{aligned}
$$

R-B1
K-B3

## Solutions to PROBLEMART

No. 1 White wins by 1 Q-QN3, threatening $2 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4$ mate: on $1 \ldots \mathrm{~N}$ any, 2 PxN and, on $1 \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 8,2 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 4$ are mate.
No. 2 White wins by $1 Q-B 5$, threaten ing 2 BxR mate: on $1 \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 4,2 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 8$ and, on $1 .$. B-B4, Q-K3 are mate.
No. 3 White wins by retreating: $1 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 2$ and $1 \ldots \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 72$ Q-B2 etc, or $1 \ldots$. P-Q6 2 K-B3 etc.

$13 \ldots$ K-B5 14 P-N3 $\div$, K-B6 15 Q-Q5 $\uparrow$ or 14 . . K-N4 $15 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 34$ and $13 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 5$ $14 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3 \div$ also lead to mate.

$$
\begin{gathered}
14 \mathrm{BxP} \mathrm{\dagger} \\
\text { Mate follows } 14 \ldots
\end{gathered} \begin{gathered}
\text { Resigns } \\
\text { KxB } 15 \\
\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3 \div
\end{gathered}
$$

## Turkmenia Championship 1961

A passed chance and an over-worked Queen blacken Black's game,

SLAV DEFENSE
(by transposition)

| Liashkov |  |  |  | Khanov |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White |  |  |  | Black |
| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | P-Q4 | 6 | P-QR4 | N-Q4? |
| 2 P -QB4 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | 7 | N-K5! | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}$ |
| $3 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB3}$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{KB3}$ | 8 | PxN | Q-Q4 |
| $4 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | P-B3 |  | B-K2 | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B4}$ |
| $5 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | P-QN4 | 10 | PxP | PxP |
|  |  | 11 | R-R5 |  |



Black runs in the face of the threatened 12 BxP . Instead, 11 . . . P-QR3 12 BxP, QxNP 13 BxPi, K-Q1 offers a fight.

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
12 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3 & \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 5 \\
13 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{NP}! & \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}
\end{array}
$$

Black expects $14 \mathrm{QxB} .13 \ldots \mathrm{QxR}$ is somewhat better but also loses.

$$
14 \text { Q-R4! Resigns }
$$

Or $14 \ldots$ B-B3 $15 \mathrm{NxB}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 216 \mathrm{NxN}$ etc.


## Rostal culwss kl

- VERYTHING YOU NEED to play $E$ chess by mail is included in the complete Postal Chess Kit produced by CHESS REVIEW for the convenience of postal players. The kit contains equipment and stationery especially designed for the purpose. These aids to Postal Chess will keep your records straight, help you to avoid mistakes, give you the fullest enjoyment and benefit from your games by mail.


## Contents of Kit

One of the most important items in the kit is the Postal Chess Recorder Album - the greatest aid to postal chess ever invented. The six miniature chess sets in this album enable you to keep track of the positions, move by move, in all six games of your section. On the score-cards, supplied with the album, you record the moves of the games. The up-to-date score of each game faces the current position. Score-cards are removable. When a game is finished, remove the old card and insert a new one. 12 extra score. cards are included in the kit.

The kit also contains 100 Move-Mailing Post Cards for sending moves to your opponents, a Chess Type Stamping Outfit or printing positions on the mailing zards, a Game Score Pad of 100 sheets for submitting scores of games to be adjudicated or published, complete instruc. tions on how to play chess by mail, an account of the Postal Chess rating system and the Official Rules of Postal Chess.

## Saves You Money

Bought separately, the contents would amount to $\$ 8.35$. The complete kit costs only $\$ 6.50$. To order, just mail the coupon below.


CHESS REVIEW
Postal Chess Dept.
134 West 72d St.,
New York, N. Y. 10023
1 enclose $\$ 6.50$. Please send me a complete Postal Chess Kit by return mail.

NAME
ADDRESS
CITY


# IN 75 CASH PRIZES 

To befit the Championship, there are added prizes in the form of handsome plaques, suitably inscribed


Seventy-Five Cash Prizes, amounting to a total of $\$ 1000.00$, will be awarded to the seventy-five players who finish with highest scores in the Eighteenth Annual Golden Knights Postal Championship now rumning! Entries accepted from December 1, 1964 to end of November, 1965 (must bear postmark of no later than November 30, 1965).

This is the 1965 Golden Knights

## PRIZES FOR EVERYBODY

But that isn't all! Every contestant can win a prize of some kind! You can train your sights on that big $\$ 250.00$ first prize, or one of the other 74 cash prizes, but even if you don't finish in the money you can win a valuable consolation prize. Every player who qualifies for the final round, and completes his playing schedule, will be awarded the emblem of the Golden Knight-a sterling silver, gold-plated and enameled lapel button, reproduced above. You earn the right to wear this handsome emblem in your buttonhole if you qualify as a Golden Knight finalist, whether or not you win a cash prize.

And even if you fail to qualify for the finals, you still get a prize! If you are eliminated in the preliminary or semi-final round, but complete your playing schedule, you will receive one free entry (worth $\$ 1.50$ ) into our regular Class Tournament or can enter our regular Prize Tournament (entry worth $\$ 2.75$ ) on payment of only $\$ 1.50$. First and second in each Prize Tournament win a $\$ 6$ and $\$ 3$ credit respectively for purchase of chess books or chess equipment.

FOR SPECIAL RULES
SEE REVERSE SIDE OF PAGE

FIRST PRIZE . . \$250.00<br>Second Prize $\$ 100 \mid$ Sixth Prize $\$ 40$ Third Prize $\quad \$ 80$ Seventh Prize $\$ 30$ Fourth Prize \$65 Eighth Prize \$25 Fifth Prize $\quad \$ 50 \mid$ Ninth Prize $\quad \$ 20$ Tenth Prize $\$ 15$ 65 Prizes - Eleventh to Seventy-fifth<br>and the golden knights emblems!

for the winners of the first five places in this national event, as well as the Golden Knights emblems.

## OPEN TO ALL CLASSES OF PLAYERS

Even if you've never played in a competitive event before, you may turn out to be Golden Knights champion or a leading prize-winner-and, at least, you'll have lots of fun. For all classes of postal player: compete together in this "open" Postal Chess event.

Beginners are welcome. If you've just started to play chess, by all means enter. There is no better way of improving your skill.

## MAIL YOUR ENTRY NOW

As a Golden Knighter you'll enjoy the thrill of competing for big cash prizes. You'll meet new friends by mail, improve your game, and have a whale of a good time. So get started-enter this big event now! The entry fee is only $\$ 4.00$. You pay no additional fees if you qualify for the semi-final or final rounds. But you can enter other first round sections at $\$ 4.00$ each (see Special Rules for Golden Knights). You will receive Postal Chess instructions with your assignment to a tournament section. Fill in and mail this coupon NOW!

```
CHESS REVIEW
134 West 72d St.,
New York, N. Y. }1002
\(\square\) Check bere if you are a netucomer to Postal Chess. Start me as CLASS
```

I enclose $\$ \ldots .$. ... Enter my name in ......... (how many?) sections(s) of the Eighteenth Annual Golden Knights Postal Chess Championship Tournament. The amount enclosed covers the entry fee of $\$ 4.00$ per section.

> Print Clearly

Check bere if already a reg. istered Postalite.

Name

## Address

City


[^0]:    * See account, page 98 , April issue. Dr. Euwe had not had the news of Botvimnik's "retirement" when writing this story, did soon after-Ed.

[^1]:    $\dagger=$ check; $\ddagger=$ dbl. check; $:=$ dis. ch.

[^2]:    Commentary by Tigran Petrosyan came from same article as on page 104, April issue, 32d USSR Chess Championship, courtesy of the Novosti Press Agency.-Ed.

[^3]:    *A. Stenchklein says: "In the ending. you (:an't afford to get the wind up!."

[^4]:    Thus speaks our end-game expert Walter Korn who "with his other hand" puts out volumes on openings only to find that some whole openings and scads of variations go out of fashion within th few years.-Ed. 2 It seems only fair to remark that Fine also postulates useful general rules in his Basic Chess Endings,-Ed.
    3 Cheron did not know that the writer had been Isenegser's guest the day before in Basle. Nor did either know that Isenegger would shortly after be the victim of a fatal heart attack.-W, K.

[^5]:    "Sure l'll play you. But don't stick it on my bill at forty bucks an hour!

[^6]:    *Trifunovich-Gligorich. Mar del Plata 1953. seems to indicate a way out here: 17 1-K4! is Q-R6, QXRT 19 QxQ. PxN 20 P-KR4, B-B4 Drawn. The main question may be how convincing the draw is.-Ed. " Black may still have "outs." Fine's PCO suggests $8 .$. QN-Q2 from the Tournament Book of the 1939 USSR Championship as worth a try: 9 O-O, BxN 10 PxB, Q-Rt or $9 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N}$, $, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} 10 \mathrm{KBxN}, \mathrm{BxB} 11 \mathrm{P}$-K5, Q-Rt! And Modern Chess Openings, 9th Ed, cites Horowitz' \& .... BxN $\dagger 9$ PxB, QN-Q2 for equality.-Ed.

[^7]:    4 Simon and Schuster, $\$ 5.95$, available from

[^8]:    $\dagger=$ check; $\ddagger=$ dbl. check; $\S=$ dis. ch.

[^9]:    1 See This Made Chess History by Hatrknexs and Battell, Feb. to Nov. 1947.-Ed.

[^10]:    $\ddagger=$ check; $\ddagger=$ dbl. check: $\S=$ dis, ch.

