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## BIBLIOPHILES!

Glossy paper, handsome print, spacious paging and all the other appurtenances of exquisite book-making combine to make this the handsomest of chess books!

# CHESS <br> OPENINGS: Theory and Practice 

## BY <br> I. A. HOROWITZ in collaboration with Former World Champion, Dr. Max Euwe, Ernest Gruenfeld, Hans Kmoch, and many other authorities

This 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 position. 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, a wide margin for inserting notes and variation-identifying diagrams are other plus features.

In addition to all else, this book contains 439 complete games- $a$ golden treasury in itself!

Please send me Chess Openings: Theory and Practice at $\$ 12.50$
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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 Association. CL: Chess League. Rd: rounds. USCF dues: $\$ 5$ membership per year.

## 1965 UNITED STATES OPEN <br> July 25 to August 7 §

at University of Puerto Rico, San Juan, Puerto Rico: 12 Rd SS Tmt: $\$ \$$, fund of \$4500: Speed Championship, August 1st: nutice received offers "package deal" at $\$ 250$ including all expenses. EF, air passage, meals, rooms \& tours but asks reservations by June 26: suggest you write: U. S. Open Chess Tournament, Box 3182, San Juan, Puerto Rico or U. S. Chess Federation, 80 East 11 Street, New York, New York 10003, air mail, to learn what you can do in July.

## U. S. Junior Championship for the John W. Collins Trophy

at Northeastern University, Huntington Av., Boston, Mass., July 16 to 21: EF $\$ 6.50$ plus USCF dues, restricted to under 21: special housing at Northeastern, 6 nights, 21 meals $\$ 30$ : advance EFs to B . Landey, 26 Norfolk Place, Sharon, Mass.
Missouri - July 1 to 5
9th Western Open at Sheraton-Jefferson Hotel, St. Louis, Missouri: 9 Rd SS

> § Notice received long after our June issue was in print. Sorry!

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!

Tmt, 50 moves $/ 2 \frac{1}{2}$ hours: register by 7 Pm, July 1, play starts $8 \mathrm{Pm}, 2 \mathrm{Rd} 12 \mathrm{~m}$ \& 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.
District of Columbia - July 2 to 5 §
Eastern Open at Burlington Hotel, 1120 Vermont Avenue NW, Washington, D. C. 8 Rd SS Tmt, $2 \mathrm{Rd} /$ day: register from 10 am, July 2: EF $\$ 12$ (under 18 \$7) plus USCF dues: $\$ 8 \$ 900$ fund; 1st $\$ 400$, 2nd $\$ 250$, 3d $\$ 150$, trophies for all classes, juniors, women \& unrated; more if EFs warrant: inquiries to Ev Raffel, 10103 Leder Road, Silver Spring, Maryland.
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 $7 \mathrm{PM}, \mathrm{July} 2$ : in 3 divisions: Open Championship EF $\$ 15$ plus USCF \& SCA dues: $\$ \$ \$ 300$ guaranteed for 1st \& 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 $\$ 8$ \& SCA dues: $\$ 20$ \& trophy to 1st: also Speed Tournament; EF \$2, trophy: more $\$ \$$ as $E F s$ 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.
Vermont - July 17 to 18
2nd Vermont Open at Edwin W. Lawrence Recreation Center, 86 Center St., Ruthland. Vermont: 5 Rd SS Tmt, 40 moves $/ 90$ minutes: register by 9 am, July 17: EF $\$ 10$ plus USCF dues: $\$ \$$ 1st (Concluded on page 198)

[^0]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.


## COMPUTING A WIN

The Numerical Programming for Computer Chess (see May, page 157; June, page 180; and page 212, this issue) gives some employable suggestions for human approach to difficult positions. You might try them here. At any rate, score yourself excellent for 10 correct solutions; good for 8: and fair for 6 with a simple abacus to toll your score. In this quiz, it is white to move and win on all odd-numbered positions; and Black to take his reckoning on even ones.


1 Reckon up the score here, chess fans. The Pawns are, curiously enough, all even. But, materialwise, Black is a full Bishop to the uncontestable good. Position-wise, both Kings are hemmed in. Black has a Bishop out of action; so has White. So Black's well up. But White wins!-how?


4 It requires no mechanical, electronic or other computer to call off the score here. materialistically speaking: White by two Pawns. It does take something to credit the positional points, though. Both sides are deployed. Are they equally effective? Well. it's Black to win; and you to say how:


8 A quick accounting here shows that Black has himself one Knight minus for a large nothing, toward a win, that is, eiphering materialistically. Now zero in on the position. If you believe, as Black, you are in dire straits, enumerate your full, if straitened, resources before dying!

5 It takes no genius here to cipher the standing on a piece and Pawn basis. A simple bit of statisticianing shows Black ahead by virtue (or defect?) of one Pawn. It takes a tangible touch of genius, though, to furnish a competent estimate of the position. Get no cipher. Win!


9 By the evaluation stick of Numerical Programming or on any other scheme of tallying points, we believe. White wins here. And so he did in Schmid-Keres, page 79, March issue, in eighty. eight moves (fifteen from here). J. R. Hill of Ft. William, Ontario, sees a quicker win. Can you?


2 Toting up the plusses 'n minuses here, we find the Blacks are not so badly in arrears materialistically speaking: one Pawn. On the positional side, he seems well ahead, all in all. So it does appear reasonable to prognosticate a victory for the sable soldiers. Ah! yes. But find the win?



10 Pieces and Pawns come to even Steven in this position, and controlled terrain looks, on superficial appraisal, also six of one and a halfdozen of the other, too. Evaluate the degree of control, though, and you may find a win! Can you?

Solutions on page 217.

## INTERNATIONAL

## The Challengers Round

Play to determine the next challenger for the World Championship goes on apace. Boris Spassky has emerged from the first bracket of matches (for all games, see pages 220 and 221; for Euwe's highlight of the Geller-Smyslov match, see page 200; and, for a flash on Spas-sky-Geller result, see page 201). We expect word on the bracket with former World Champion Mikhail Tahl. Lajos Portisch, Bent Larsen and Borislav Ivkov by next month.

## Exłra Plumage

A light, horny epidermal oulgrowth helping to form the external covering of a bird's body-in short, a feather-was added to the already well-decorated cap of A. O'Kelly of Belgium when he plucked first prize from the Stevenson Memorial Tournament at Bognor Regis, Eng. land. He went without loss through eleven rounds of a tough twenty-one-man field, winning seven games and drawing four. One point behind was R. G. Wade, also undefeated, while a $71 / 2 \cdot 31 / 2$ tie for third was registered by 0 . M. Hindle, C. Kottnauer and D. Andric.

## Event in Hungary

In a strong tournament at Budapest, Laszlo Szabo of Hungary joined the Rus. sian representatives Lev Polugayevsky and Mark Taimanov in a triple tie for first with 11-4 each. Fourth was Janosevich of Yugoslavia, $91 / 2 \cdot 51 / 2$.

## Team Tourney

West Germany once again made sho:t work of its opposition in the Clare Benedict Team Tournament and, with $151 / 2 \cdot 41 / 2$ in standing, finished three full points ahead of second-place Spain. Other scores: Holland, 101/2.911/2; England, 9-11; Austria, $71 / 2 \cdot 121 / 2 ;$ Switzerland, $5 \cdot 15$. The "Little Olympiad" has been held in Switzerland for many years, but this time was switched to West Berlin.

## Railwaymen's Affair

In the Sixth European Team Championship for Railwaymen, held at Kecskemet, Hungary, the Soviet group came in first,


ALBERIC O'KELLY de GALWAY
followed by the Bulgarians and the Roumanians in second and third places respectively. Eighteen countries fielded a total of almost 150 players, a number of whom have first-class international reputations. Best individual scorer on first board was V. Popov of Bulgaria. V. Borissenko of the Soviet Union and Zandor Nilsson of Sweden were among other strong competitors.

## Respite in Antarctica

Alvan S. Hollander, president of the Canterbury Chess Club in Christchurch, New Zealand, informs us that a team representing his club played a radio-telephone match with American scientists and military men at McMurdo Station, Antarctica, 2,400 miles away. The result was a $41 / 2-21 / 2$ success for Canterbury, thanks to wins by A. J. Nyman, E. B. Stroud, J. T. Dixon and D. W. Martin plus a draw between C. McKay (Canterbury) and S. J. Davis. For McMurdo Station the victors were Marvin J. Muchow and J. L. Blades. Plummeting temperatures and almost total darkness formed the backdrop for the Antarctica base during the one-day match.

The Canterbury Chess Club, now in its ninety-ninth year, will celebrate its centennial with an international tournament for which a prize fund of about $\$ 3,000$ will be provided.

## Undone by Ukrainians

Four rounds of play in a match between Bulgaria and the Ukraine saw the latter triumphant with a $231 / 2-161 / 2$ score. L. Stein headed the Ukrainian team, while Pudewski played top board for Bulgaria. Each group consisted of eight men and two women.

## UNITED STATES

## REGIONAL AND INTERSTATE

## Upset

Thomas Meola of Maplewood, New Jersey, scored a surprise victory in the South Jersey Amateur Open when he notched a winning $5-1$ tally. Robert Durkin and Alan Soble also scored 5-1, but finished below Meola on a tie-break. There were 74 participants.

## War between Two States

Hard fighting marked the amnual en. counter between Connecticut and Massachusetts, with the former gaining a narrow $21-19$ success. The ten-year series of matches now stands at 6.4 in favor of Massachusetts.

## IN MEMORIAM

The Library of Fred Reinfeld, chess champion, writer and teacher who died last year, has been given to New York University by his widow, Mrs. Beatrice Reinfeld.
The collection of more than 1,000 books on chess, includes a group of tour. nament books, books about the world's chess masters and a general library covering the game in English, French, German, Russian, Spanish and other languages.
Included are a collection of international chess periodicals from 1880 to 1964 and a number of the more than 260 books written by Mr. Reinfeld. He was New York State chess champion in 1931 and 1933 and was Executive Editor of Chess review.


ON THE COVER: Robert J. Fischer played 21 United Nations Chess Club members and 5 other experts in a simultaneous in June at the UN. He lost to Vladimir Vakula of the USSR and Luis Loaya of Peru (Secretary of the Club) and drew with E. Zhukov of the USSR, but won all the rest. The event was sponsored by TAG, manufacturer of adult games, played on TAG's Mandarin chess tables and its new Mandarin chessmen. On the cover, Fischer is interviewed by Jean Parr of CBS-TV (Channel 2). Fischer, as usual, played 1 P-K4 on each and every board.

## Liberty Bell Open

The Liberty Bell Open in Pliladelphia was pocketed by Jack Pineo of New York with a 4.1 score and the best Swiss totals. N. Goregliad of Philadelphia also made a $4-1$ showing, but was relegated to second place on a tiebreak.

## They Did Pass!

Kenneth R. Smith of Dallas, Texas, and Allan S. Troy of Ventura, California, jointly won the El Paso Open. First and second prizes consisted of a trophy and $\$ 150$. Top women's honors were gained by Greta P. Olsson.

## Deep South Doings

The Louisiana-Mississippi Open, held in Natchez, went to Frank M. RePass, $41 / 2-1 / 2$. Second in the twenty-two-man tourney was A. L. McAuley, 4-1.

## Honors to Albrecht and Platz

In the annual Western Massachusetts and Connecticut Valley Championship, attended by eighty players, Klaus H. Albrecht and Dr. Joseph Platz tied for first and second with $5^{1} / 2^{-1 / 2}$ each. Next, with 5.1 each, were George Krauss, Edward J. Kotski and Jerry De Pesquo.

## IDAHO

With a 5.0 sweep, Dick Vandenburg won his third consecutive Idaho State

Championship, played in Twin Falls' new YMCA building. lloyd Kimpton, 3-2, was rumnerup. Of a total of 24 participants, 8 comprised the Class A group.

## MARYLAND

Peter Graves of Bethesda, Maryland, who won the state's Junior Open last year, is now Maryland open champion as well. He was a clear first with $51 / 2-1 / 2$ in the title tourney, followed by a quintet scoring 5-1. Jack Mayer was runnerup on a tiebreak.
Best individual showing on first board in the Maryland Chess League was made by H. R. McComas, 6-1.

## PUERTO RICO

Felix Sacarello and Luis Suarez, each $81 / 2 \cdot 21 / 2$, jointly won a twelve-man round robin for the Puerto Rican championship. A playoff is scheduled for the near future. Arturo Colon, 8-3, placed third.

## WISCONSIN

In the Wisconsin Invitational, Charles Weldon was successful with a $41 / 2-1 / 2$ tally, which won him a first prize of $\$ 100$. Second in the fourteen-man contest was William Martz, $31 / 2 \cdot-1 \frac{1}{2}$.

## LOCAL EVENTS

Alabama. A playoff for the Huntsville Chess Club championship went to Dale Ruth by 2-0, after he and Ken William. son had each scored $4-1$ in the title tourney.
The Birmingham Chess Club nosed out the Huntsville Chess Club by 9-8. Ned Hardy and Don Whaley each tallied 2.0 for Birmingham, and Terrell Deaton was a dual winner for Huntsville.

Calijornia. A rousing finish in the South California Chess League saw the Downey


Peter Graves vs. Edmund Nash and Alan Boldt vs. William Goichberg, with William Bragg looking on, in final round in Maryland Open; Goichberg was in tie for 2nd

Chess Club, $21 \frac{1}{2} \cdot 141 / 2$, overtake the City Terrace team, $20-16$, when the latter was tripped by Monterey Park after leading comfortably until the last round.

Seventeen-year-old Aki Kanamori of the Kolty Chess Club in San Francisco is reported as becoming more menacing with each tournament. In the Walnut Creek Open, a ninety-one-player affair, he took first with $41 / 2^{-1 / 2}$ by polishing off Walter Dorne in the final session. This victory he followed up in the ninety-player Berkeley Open, where his last-round victim was Sam Sloan. Here, too, Kanamori scored a clear first of $41 / 2-1 / 2$, in front of Paul Vayssie, 4-1.

At the Redwood Empire Open, K. Tullus of Fresno registered a $41 / 2^{-1 / 2}$ tally and thereby snared a $\$ 100$ first prize. Curt Wilson, David Blohm and Alan Benson each scored 4-1, tie-breaking points placing them in the order named.

District of Columbia. Frank Street and Ken Clayton tied for first in an eight-man round robin for the Washington Chess Divan title, but Street was declared Champion when he won a playoff by $21 / 2-11 / 2$.
Florida. The St. Petersburg Chess Club championship was won by Maurice Leysens, $71 / 2 \cdot 11 / 2$. Tied for second in the round robin were Richard Sylvester and Conrad Batchelder, 7-2 each.
Idaho. In the ten-man competition for the Eastern Idaho title, Eugene Cowan triumphed with a 4.0 sweep, followed by Dee Harris and R. K. Hart, each 3-1. Harris was runnerup on Solkoff tiebreak,

The fine score of $11-1$ spelled victory for A. B. Ellis in the double round robin for the Canyon County championship. Next were Jerry Stanke, $9-3$, and C. E. Harris, $61 / 2 \cdot 5^{1} / 2$.
Minnesota. Fourteen players, culled from the ranks of the 3 M Chess Club and the St. Paul Chess Club, composed the entry list in a recent "cyclone" which resulted in a 4 -1 tie for the first between W. Dane Smith and Keith Smith. The former won out on a Solkoff-point superiority.

Washington. Dr. Anton Walloch was a clear first with $5-1$ in the sixteen-man Pierce County Closed Championship. Ernst Rasmussen and Carl E. Carlson, each $41 / 2-11 / 2$, finished second and third respectively on median points.

The University of Washington championship was won by Clark Harmon, 4-0. Runnerup was Kent Pullen, $31 / 2-1 / 2$.

## CANADA

Montreal trimmed Ottawa by $111 / 2-61 / 2$. According to Moe Moss, the game that attracted most attention, because of its richness in vicissitudes, was contested on first board between Dr. F. Bohatirchuk of Ottawa and Leslie Witt of Montreal.

Eventually, however, the complications cleared up and the game was given up as drawn.

## FOREIGN

## Australia

A playoff for the Australian Championship went to D. G. Hamilton with $61 / 2 \cdot 1 \frac{1}{2}$, although C. J. S. Purdy's defeat was not so one-sided as indicated by the score.

## Bulgaria

Dr. N. Minev, $91 / 2 \cdot 31 / 2$, won the Bulgarian championship, followed by Radulov, 9-4.

In the women's national title event, Venka Assenova finished two full points ahead of her closest rival, P. Todorova.

## England

London University's first team won the universities' leam championship, and Cambridge's first team was runnerup.

## South Africa

A double-round match between East London and Port Elizabeth terminated in a $10-10$ tie.

## Yugoslavia

With a $13-6$ score, Milan Matulovich became new Yugoslay kingpin. Svetozar Gligorich and Bruno Parma tied for second with 12.7 each.


INTERCOLLEGIATE TEAM CHAMPIONS
James West, Carter Waid (rear), Jude Acers (with Southwest Intercollegiate Individual trophy) and Karl Cavanaugh (with team trophy) of Louisiana State University won the Southern-Southwest Intercollegiate title (see "Dual Area College Titles," pages $164-5$, June)

## 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." - Arbeiter. Zeitung. "One of the few books which, at a glance, one can recognize as an immortal." - Chess.

304 pages, 182 diagrams
$\$ 5.50$

> The world's foremost publisher of books on CHESS Send for free catalogue of chess publications to

DAVID McKAY COMPANY, Inc., 750 Third Av., New York, N. Y. 10017

TOURNAMENT CALENDAR

## (Concluded from page 193)

\$100, others to highest Expert, A, B, C, D) and unrated: advance EFs, information, lodging to Ralph Williams, 13 Elm, West Rutland, Vermont.

## North Carolina - July 23 to 25

Charlotte Queen City Open at YMCA, Morehead St., Charlotte, N. C. 6 Rd SS Tmt, 50 moves $/ 2$ hours; EF $\$ 5$ plus USCF \& NCCA dues: $\$ \$ 1$ st $\$ 50$ \& for highest $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B} \& \mathrm{C}$ players: register by 12 M, July 23: inquiries to R Grady Brown, 3921 Woodleaf Rd., Charlotte 5, Nortlı Carolina.

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 sec onds 1 move: EF $\$ 1$ : $\$$ : Team Cham-


THE MIKADO, the finest peg-in set available, made of smoothly finishod Tsuge wood in a handsome Staunton cherry pattern (King height $1^{\prime \prime}$ ), is a superb gift for a real chess friend. It is enhanced by a handmade two-tone leather board and an unfolding case attractively covered in rayon velvet.

When opened (see small photo), the hinges slide the top underneath to become the supporting base (as in top photo). Closed size is $71 / 8^{\prime \prime}$ by $51 / 8^{\prime \prime}$ by $17 / 8^{\prime \prime}$. Playing board is $41 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ square.

The size of board and men gives excellent playing visibility. The design of men is both finely artistic and, with their exceptional size, of top quality for play. ing purposes.

Order from CHESS REVIEW Catalogue \#181

## Price Postpaid $\$ 15.00$

pionship 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.

## Arkansas - July 31 to August 1

9th Arkansas Open at DeSoto Hotel, Hot Springs, Arkansas: 5 Rd SS Tmt, 45 moves $/ 2$ hours (optional 1st Rd, night of 30 th) : $\$ \$$ four, with $\$ 100$ for 1st guaranteed: Reserve section, limited to Class C \& unrated: EF $\$ 6$ plus USCF dues: inquiries to Majeed Nahas, Box 192, Lake Hamilton, Arkansas 71951.

## California - August 15

15 th Annual Valley of the Moon Chess Festival on Plaza of Sonoma. California: short tournament starts 10 Am , four-man sections, prize to each, Classes $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{C}$, woman, juniors (under 14) : also simultaneous exhibits, problem-solving contest \& other activities: trophies, books \& "surprise" prizes donated by merchants: combine chess \& family picnic: inquiries to George Powell, Sonoma Valley Chamber of Commerce, 461 First Street West, Sonoma, California 95476.

New York - August 21 to 22 \& 28 to 29
New York City Junior Championship at Henry Hudson Hotel, 353 West 57 St., New York: 8 Rd SS Tmt, 50 moves $/ 2$ hours, at 10 Am and $3: 30 \mathrm{PM}$ each day: EF $\$ 3$ ( $\$ 2$ if revd by Aug. 17) plus USCF dues, $\$ 4$ : open to all under 21 regardless of residence: register by $9: 30$ Am, Aug. 21: trophies to 1 st $5 \&$ top under-sixteen \& under-thirteen; merchandize prizes, minimum values to 1 st, $\$ 50$; to 2nd, $\$ 30 \&$ to 3d, $\$ 20 \&$ Manhattan CC memberships: EFs \& inquiries to W. Goichberg, 450 E. Prospect Av., Mt. Vernon, New York 10553.

## 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 ( $\$ 2$ ) : $\$ \$ 90 \%$ of EFs to top 3, trophy to 1st: inquiries to R. Wallace, $13271 / 2$ East Dakota, Pierre, South Dakota.

Massachusetts - September 3-6
New England Open at Sheraton-Boston Hotel, 39 Dalton Road, Prudential Center, Boston, Massachusetts: Championship Division, 7 Rd SS Tmt, 40 moves/ 2 hours: entries close 5 pm, Sept. 1: EF $\$ 15$ plus USCF dues: $\$ \$$,$] st \$ 200$, others: Reserve Division (under 1800 rating): EF $\$ 12$ plus USCF dues: $\$ \$$, 1st $\$ 75$, others: 50 moves 2 houts: inquiries to R. B. Goodspeed, 981 Plymouth Street, Bridgewater, Massachusetts 02324.

Michigan - September 3-6
1965 Annual Michigan Open at the Hart Hotel, 31 North Washington, Batlle Creek, Michigan: 7 Rd SS Tmt. 50 moves/ 2 hours: register by 7:30 pm, Sept. 3, 1st Rd 8 pm, 2 each, Sept. 4. 5 \& 6: $\$ \$ 10$, 1st $\$ 100$, trophy to highest Michigander, trophies or $\$ \$$ to top A, B, C, woman, junior \& family, upset, shortest checkmate \& youngest winner: EF $\$ 7.50$ (under 18 , \$5) plus USCF dues: Speed Championship, 9 am, Sept. 5: 5 minute/game: EF \$1 \& \$8: inquiries to Mrs. E. R. Shafer, 117 Lamora, Battle Creek, Michigan 49017.

Ohio - September 3 to 6
Ohio Chess Congress in Kennedy Memorial Hall, Univ. of Dayton, Dayton, Ohio: Ohio Championship, register 5-7 pM, Sept. 3: 7 Rd SS Tmt: EF $\$ 7.50$ plus USCF \& OCA dues: $\$ \$ 65 \%$ of EFs; Round Robin Tournaments, register by 1:30 PM, Sept. 4: EF \$4, rated, 6 per section, trophy to winner; Amateur Open, register by 7 pm , Sept. 4, no restrictions, EF \$4, trophy to winner: inquiries to Ohio Chess Association, 706 Mt . Hope, Cincinnati, Ohio 45204.

## lowa - September 4 to 5

11 th Annual Lowa Open at Montrose Hotel. 223, 3 Av. SE, Cedar Rapids, Iuwa: 5 Rd SS Tmt. 40 moves/ 100 miriutes: Championship EF $\$ 6$ plus USCF dues: $\$ \$$ fund at least $\$ 200,1$ st $\$ 50, \$ \$$ through 6 th and to top $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B} \& \mathrm{C}$ : Middle Division (under 1700 rating \& over 16 years) EF $\$ 4$ and USCF dues, trophies to 1st \& 2d: Junior Division (under 19) EF $\$ 2$, trophy to lst: register by noon: inquiries to J. M. Osness, 320 Columbia Circle, Waterloo, Iowa 50701.

## Arizona - September 4 to 6

Rocky Mountain Open at Ramada Inn, 3801 East Van Buren St., Phoenix, Arizona: 6 Rd SS Tmt, 45 moves/2 hours, 20 per after: EF $\$ 10$ (under 21, $\$ 5$ ) plus USCF dues: $\$ \$ 1$ st $\$ 200,2 \mathrm{~d} \$ 100,3 \mathrm{~d} \$ 50$ \& trophies to all class winners: inquiries to James Aden, 7249 E. Coronado Rd., Scottsdale, Arizona 85257.

## New York - September 4 to 6

New York State Open Championship at Hotel Richford, 210 Delaware Av., Buffalo, New York: 6 Rd SS Tmt, 50 moves/ 2 hours: $\$ \$, 1$ st $\$ 200$, others \& trophies: EF $\$ 10$ plus USCF \& NYSCA dues: inquiries to George Mauer, 14 Rawlins St. Buffalo, New York 14211.
Connecticut - September 25 to 26
Hartford Amateur Open at YMCA, 315 Pearl St., Hartford, Conn., restricted to under 2000 ratings, open to unrated: 7 Rd SS Tmt, 30 moves/hour: play begins 10 AM : EF $\$ 6$ ( $\$ 5$ if received by Sept. 18): ten trophies, champion and top 3 in $A, B \& C$ classes: EFs and inquiries to F. S. Townsend, 10 Bermuda Road, Wethersfield, Connecticut.

## WHERE TO PLAY CHESS

## PHOENIX CHESS CLUB

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

PRESCOTT CHESS CLUB
Prescott, Arizona: meets Wednesday. at $7: 30 \mathrm{PM}$
Phone: $445-6252$
LITTLE ROCK CHESS CLUB
Sam Spike's Insurance Office, Village Center Mall, Little Rock, Arkansas LO-52372, Friday 6 PM to midnight
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, Callfornia Meets every Monday and Friday
B. JAMES' TOURNAMENT CLUB

Where the Rest meet the Best 3554 South Western Avenue Los Angeles 18, California Daily - Noon to Midnite

CITY TERRACE CHESS CLUB 1126 North Hazard Street Los Angeles 63. California Meets Wednesday 7 to 12 PM

HERMAN STEINER CHESS CLUB 8801 Cashlo Street
Los Angeles 35, California
OAKLAND YMCA CHESS CLUB 2101 Telegraph Ave., Oakland, California 94612: Phone: 451-5711 Open Fridays at 7 PM
BROWARD COUNTY CHESS CLUB 1440 Chateau Park Rd, Ft. Lauderdale, Florlda: Mondays 7 PM "till morning" in Lauderdale Manors Recreation Ctr.

ORLANDO CHESS CLUB
Sunshine 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, Chlcago 30, Illinols 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, \& Holldays 2 PM to 2: 65c 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 evenling
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. Phone: 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, Oklahoma, meets Monday evenings.

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

by DR. MAX EUWE



## THE GELLER - SMYSLOV MATCH

The Outcome of the Spassky-Keres encounter was quite a surprise, more in some areas than others, of course. But the result of the GellerSmyslov match detonated in the chess world like a bomb, especially from the way in which Geller won.

The former world champion could scarcely keep his footing. In almost all the games, he had the worst of it. Sometimes, it was only a little the worst, and then Smyslov, through his great skill in the endgame, managed to build a bridge to a draw. But often his position was too bad, and then Geller was ruthless.

On the attack, Geller was ingenious and irresistible. His victories in the third and fifth games were flood tides in the field of attacking and combinative capabilities.

It is marvelous, also, to consider that Geller attained the Challengers Round only accidentally. He had been eliminated way back in the strong U.S.S.R. Zonal Tournament and so did not obtain even the right to compete in the Interzonal. A stranger at the feast: too bad for the Interzonal but good enough for the Challengers. Let us explain this remarkable feature in the program. In the Challengers Tournament, last held at Curacao 1962, the two highest players earn exemption from the preliminaries of the next cycle in the world championship program: at Curacao, Petrosyan and Keres. Keres won his after a playoff with Geller who scored equal points, Keres taking the match by $41 / 2-31 / 2$. Petrosyan became World Champion, and Botvinnik retired; so the place left went to Geller, the next highest at Curacao.

Geller has shown himself fully worthy of this place. The fifth game of his match with Smyslov, which practically decided the match, shows his merit especially.

Fifth Match Game Moscow 1965

GRUENFELD DEFENSE

| Yefim Ge |  |  | Vass | Smyslov |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Soviet U |  |  |  | t Union |
| White |  |  |  | Black |
| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | N-KB3 | 5 | P-K4 | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}$ |
| 2 P -QB4 | P-KN3 | 6 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{N}$ | B-N2 |
| $3 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | P-Q4 | 7 | B-QB | P-B4 |
| $4 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | 8 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |  |

Nothing new under the sun. This, the old Kostich line in the Exchange Variation is one of the oldest lines in the Gruenfeld.*

| $8 \cdots \cdots$ | $O-O$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $90-O$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B3} 3$ |
| 10 B-K3 | $\cdots$ |

[^1]
$10 \ldots$
Q-B2
10 . . PxP 11 PxP, B-N5 12 P-B3, $N-R 4$ is recommended by theory. But Smyslov has his own theory. It is some. what doubtful, however, that the text is an actual improvement over the usual continuation.

[^2]11 R-B1
$12 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$
R-Q1

Geller evaluates this position as ripe for attack.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
12 \ldots & P-K 3 \\
13 K-R 1 & P-N 3
\end{array}
$$


$14 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$ !
Most surprising. The text amounts to the offer of a Pawn, and it is not easy to determine what Geller had in mind if his opponent accepted the challenge.

Some possibilities are: 14 . . KP×P $15 \mathrm{PxP}, \mathrm{BxBP} 16 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ leads to nothing for White. Neither does $14 \ldots$. KPxP $15 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3$, PxQP $16 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{KN} 5, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 3$. The best continuation for White is 15 B-KN5. R-KI [not 15. . . R-Q3 16 $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 4] 16 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3$, and (1) $16 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3$ ? 17 PxKBP, PxB 18 PxNP, and White wins; (2) $16 \ldots \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 417 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 5, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ $18 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$ and PxKBP, with a White plus.

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
14 \ldots & \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 4 \\
15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3 & \mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{P} \\
16 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{KBP} & \ldots . .
\end{array}
$$

White's King Bishop Pawn exercises considerable pressure on Black's position. From now on. the latter has continually to regard both $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6$ and PxNP .

| $16 \ldots \mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $17 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ |
| $18 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |

The threat is 19 . . IRxB.
19 R-KB2
20 B-KR6
QR-Q1

Now 21 BxB is a threat followed by 21 . KxB $22 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6 \nmid$ and $23 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 6$.

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
20 \ldots \mathrm{Q} . \mathrm{B} 4 & \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{KR1} \\
21 & \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 2
\end{array}
$$

Black's last is practically forced.
(See diagram top of next column)
$22 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 4$ !
One blow after another. Black cannot rapture: 22 . . RxN $23 \mathrm{BxR}, \mathrm{QxB} 24$ Q-N8


Position after $12 \ldots$ R.Q2
22
P-B5
Black blocks off the possibility of B-QN5. Not that the move is an immediate threat: e.g. 23 PxNP. RPxP 24 B-QN5 allows Black a way out: 24. . . $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{N}$ [of course not $24 . . \mathrm{Q} . \mathrm{B}$ be cause of $25 \times-\mathrm{B} 6 \dot{1}, \mathrm{BxN} 26 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$ ete.].

The real threat is $23 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P} 24$ $\mathrm{PxP}, \mathrm{RPxP} 25 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 6 \div, \mathrm{BxN} 26 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 1$ $27 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{QN} 5$ :

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
23 \text { B-B2 } & R / 2-K 2 \\
24 \text { QR-B1! } & \ldots .
\end{array}
$$

Once again, White sacrifices.

$$
24 \ldots \quad R \times N
$$

And, at last, Black accepts. He has no moves, anyhow - no good moves.


25 PxP!!
This is a fascinating combination, worthy of a candidate for the world (hampionship.
$25 \ldots$.
P-B3

"He was sneaking up on Bradshaw and, since I had a winning position in an adjourned game back in camp ... ."

Of course not 25. . RxQ 26 PxRP mate.

26 Q-N5!
Crescendo. Now the main threat is 27 P-N7!

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
26 \\
27 \text { K-N1! } & Q-Q 2 \\
\ldots
\end{array}
$$

The text demonstrates Black's helplessness. But it will soon become clear why White's King stands better on N1.
$27 \ldots$
B-N2


28 RxP !
Of White's last seven moves, six involved sacrifices!

$$
28 \ldots \quad R-N 5
$$

Or 28 +. BxR 29 QxB, PxP 30 QxPt, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 131 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5$ ! Then $31 \ldots \mathrm{R} / 4-\mathrm{K} 3$ fails against $32 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 6 \dagger, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B} 33 \mathrm{RxR}$ !

Here we see the importance of White's $27 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1$ : it allows that 33 RxR !

On 28. . PxP, White wins by 29 QxP threatening $30 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7$.

The text, however, loses at once.


## SPASSKY PREVAILS!

Near time to go to press, we hear that Boris Spassky has played and won the Semi-final Match with Yefim Geller, needing only eight games to reach the decision.

Now he, and we all, wait to see who emerges from the other bracket: Mikhail Tahl vs. Lajos Portisch; and Bent Larsen vs. Borislav Ivkov: Russian, Hungarian, Dane or Yugoslav.

We expect the Quarter-finals results by the next issue, and Euwe's coverage of a Spassky-Geller game.

## SHAKHMATY

NOW IN ENGLISH!!

## - Games annotated by the leading Russians! <br> - Surveys of all great tournaments! <br> - Pictures - Reviews - Problems - Endgames Opening Analysis - Brilliant Bits of Play

The complete, unabridged editions of this outstanding Russian magazine will be published twelve times a year in magazine form. Subscriptions will begin about July 1, 1965. The translation of the Jan., 1965 issue of "Shakhmaty" will be the "SHAKHMATY-IN-ENGLISH" first edition.

## One year: $\$ 11.00$

## Mail your cheek or M. O. to: <br> SHAKHMATY-IN-ENGLISH

P. O. Box 91

Woodmont, Conn.

# SARAJEVO 8 

## By DR. PETAR TRIFUNOVICH



Dr. Trifunovich

It is practically a rule now that the winner at Sarajevo is re-invited to the next tournament there. So the grandmasters Lev Polugayevsky of the USSR and Wolfgang Uhlmamn of East Germany were the guests this time. Polugayevsky was accompanied by International Master Alexander Suetin; and, in view of the fact that of the best Yugoslavs, only Milan Matulovich, the current Champion, and Petar Trifunovich were present, everyone confidently expected Polugayevsky to repeat and likewise Uhlmann on his excellent form of late, with $1-2$ in the Sarajevo 7 and 1-2 (with Vassily Smyslov) in Havana 1964, or at least that these two would be the principal contenders for first prize.

This opinion amounted to an obsession which affected the whole competition. For Polugayevsky, it seems, he felt under a veritable burden that he must win. Suetin, who conceives of chess as competition and not a mathematical theorem, was angered by such prognostications, and so summoned all possible exertion to upset them. The photo shows how earnestly he crouched at the board!

And Suetin had an added impulse, for the tournament was of such caliber that a FIDE grandmaster title could be won, He firmly decided to prove there were no reserved places in the tournament. In the first round, he won from Matulovich, then successively in the sixth to eighth from Chirich, Uhlmann and Polugayevsky. So it became manifest that here was another of the great players shadowed by the reputation of his Soviet colleagues.

Uhlmann lost his chance for first as he was defeated by both the Soviet contenders. Playing the French which he has used so often with great success, he ran into a debacle against Suetin.

Polugayevsky, with extreme effort, managed to overtake Suetin two rounds before the end. Then, however, he drew with Chirich while Suetin, always on the verge of a draw, won a very long game from the Hungarian Grandmaster Levante Lengyel, who lost but this one game.

A. SUETIN

> So Suetin led by a halfpoint and had White against the Bosnian Master Kozomara while Polugayevsky, White against Matulovich, knew the latter would fight dourly for a draw to win him the grandmaster title. Caissa gives the Russian his opportunity. Suetin succeeds only in drawing, and his expression shows only too clearly that Matulovich is faring

## 8th Tournament at Sarajevo, YugosIavia 1965


badly against Polugayevsky. The latter. however, forsakes a promising King-side attack for a Rook ending with a Pawn plus-and Matulovich defends successfully. So Suetin and Matulovich both attain their cherished objectives.

Sarajevo also attained another trait: besides its fabric of draws, it has now a fabric of titles: Suetin and Matulovich became grandmasters, and the Hungarian Gyozo Forintos barely missed, by an unlucky defeat against Trifunovich. And Mihaljchisin of Banja Luka became an international master, copying his "great" countryman Kozomara who won the title last year at Sarajevo 7.

All agree the grandmaster litle suffers from inflation and so has lost much of its value. The FIDE awards the title too readily and on conditions known in advance. So agreements are made in the corridors: "Help me and I will help you. . . ." The practice is irregular and needs correction.

Matulovich saved the honor of Yugoslav chess by tying for second with Polugayevsky. But the last six places were reserved by Yugoslavs, confirming the old Bosnian tradition of being good hosts.
Trifunovich found himself in appropriate company, with other drawing masters: Lengyel, Malich and Trifunovich, and the first and last of these won one, lost one and drew all the rest.

It was rumored Robert J. Fischer would attend, and disappointment was great when the report had to be denied. There is still hope. At Sarajevo 9, Mikhail Botvinnik may play, and so perhaps, Fischer may yet be attracted. The tournament will be strong, and Fischer needs absolutely good training if he is to maintain his form.

KING'S INDIAN DEFENSE

| L. Polugayevsky |  | W. Uhlmann <br> East Germany |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Soviet Union |  |  | Black |

This is a dangerous but not the most forceful continuation, Uhlmann has so often played it against the King's Indian, one may expect to learn from him how to meet this line.

| 6 —. | P-KR3 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 7 B-K3 | P-K4 |
| 8 | QN-Q2 |

8 . . N-K1 for a quick . . . P-KB4 is better.

9 P-KR4!

Here is the difference, Black's KN3 was weakened by . . . P-KR3 and now 9 . . . N-K1 tails against $10 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5$ as 10 . . P-KB4 is no longer possible. So, already. Black lacks any logical counterplay on the Kingside.

| $9 \ldots \ldots$ | N-B4 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 10 Q-B2 | P-QR4 |
| 11 P-R5 | P-KN4 |

Black's KB4 is permanently weakened now: but the . . . P-KN4 was forced.

$$
\begin{array}{llr}
12 & \text { P-B3 } & \mathrm{N} / 3-\mathrm{Q} 2 \\
13 & \text { P-KN4 } & \ldots .
\end{array}
$$

Not only Grandmaster Polugayevsky but even a computer can play this posi. tion if you postulate the following motifs: capture the strong post KB5 for White's Knight and work on the passivity of Black's King Bishon.
13.... N-N3 $15 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 2 \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ $14 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 3 \quad \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 216 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1$
$16 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ and then $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 2$ leads more ef. ficiently to the same goal.

```
16.
\(17 \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}\)
```


## Pxp

``` Q-B3
```

The Queen is useless here. 17 $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ ! profits from the temporarily bad position of White's King and threatens . . N/3-R5 and . . . P-N4. Black needs the initiative on the Queenside at all costs. Improbable as it may seem, he is now lost.

```
1 8 \mathrm { K } - \mathrm { N } 2
KR-B1
19 KR-QB1
B-B1
```

Black is quietly trying to swap off his bad Bishop via B-K2-Q1-N3. The idea cannot prevail and the Bishop moves are all lost time. 18 . . . N/3-R5 to undertake something on the Queenside still is better. Black fails to perceive his imminent loss and to guard against the principal threat.


21 B-N5!
After this strong positional move, the fight is decided. Black cannot avoid ex. changing his strong Bishop and then White wins automatically by posting his Knight on KB5.
21.
2 … B-Q1

Naturally, White prevents $\quad \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 5$


Now 25 . . . B-N3 26 BxB (the planned exchange), N/5xB fails as, after 27 N -B5, Black cannot defend the Queen Pawn. 26 N-B5
$\dagger=$ check $; \ddagger=$ dbl. check; $\mathrm{f}=$ dis. ch.


A view of the tournament hall

Here Uhlmann can observe how an intelligent Knight appears, but it is not. his own.
26 . . .
B-K2
$28 \mathrm{R} / 1-\mathrm{QB}$
$29 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3$
P-N3
27 R-B2 B-B1 29 P-N3

Black's officers are all badly lodged except his King Knight. and that will soon be expelled by $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$ and $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 4$.

| $29 \ldots$. | $N-N 1$ | 31 | $R-B 4$ | Q-Q1 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 30 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$ | $\mathrm{~N} / 1-\mathrm{R} 3$ | $32 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 4$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
|  |  | $33 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |  |

Or $33 \ldots \mathrm{~N}$ - N 23 + RxR, Rxil 35 RxR , QxR $36 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 7$ and 37 QxN.


After $38 . . . Q x Q \dagger 39 \mathrm{RxQ}, \mathrm{RxR} \dagger 40$ K-B1, RxB $41 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 7$, Black cannot restrain the Pawn.

## FRENCH DEFENSE

A, Suetin
W. UhImann
Soviet Union
East Germany White Black

| 1 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |
| 3 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\ldots$. |

This, the Tarrasch Variation, is only prudent against Uhlmann who is unex. celled in the Winawer-Nimzovich: 3 N -QB3, B-N5.

## $3 .$. <br> N-K B3

Uhlmann avoids the simplifying line: 3... P-QB4. He seeks a fight, Suetin surely expected so when he chose the quiet Tarrasch continuation.

```
4 P-K5
\(K N-Q 2\)
5 P-KB4
-
```

The text, only occasionally used before, is becoming more and more populas. It is difficult to say what is better here, Trifunovich-UhImann, Zonal Tour-
nament in Halle 1963, ran: 5 B-Q3, P-QB4 6 P-QB3, N-QB3 $7 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 3$ 8 N-KB3, PxP 9 PxP, P-B3 10 PxP, N/2xP 11 O-O, B-Q3 $12 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3!$ O-O 13 B-K3! B-Q2 14 R-B1, QR-B1 $15 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 5$, and Black is very far from equality.

| 5. | P-QB4 | 8 | P-KN3 | PxP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $6 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | N-QB3 | 9 | PxP | B-N5 $\dagger$ |
| 7 QN-B3 | Q-N3 | 10 | K-E2 |  |
| Not 10 | B-Q2, | B | 3ut Wh | also |
| ims to av | excha |  |  |  |
| 10 |  |  | P- |  |

Evidently, Black aims to preclude any possibility of a King-side attack by White. But his own play now becomes extremely passive and lacks any logical countering. 10 . . . P-B3 $11 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 2, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ 12 B-Q3, B-K2 with pressure on White's center and the chance of opening the King Bishop file is what he ought to try.

## $11 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 2$

$\mathrm{N} / 2-\mathrm{N} 1$
Black ties up his Knights. Instead, he ought to build up Queen-side play by

"In a more enlightened era, those will be Tahl, Frank Marshall, Fischer, Tchigorin ..."

11 . . B-K2, . . . Q-Q1! . . . N-N3, ... B-Q2 and ... QR-B1. He is oblivious of how badly his Queen stands and does nothing to repair that factor.

| 12 | N-R3 | $B-Q 2$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 13 | N-B2 | N-R3 |
| 14 | QR-N1 | $\ldots$. |

Now Black's forces are caged helpless. ly in the face of a Queen-side Pawn ad. vance by White which cannot be stopped.

| 14. | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 15 N -Q3 | B K2 |
| 16 | B-K3 |

Black misses a last-minute chance to check White's Pawns, by $16 \ldots$ P-QR4!
17 B-B2
$\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 4$
18 P-QN4!
$\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N}$

18 . . . N-B5 fails after 19 P-R4, and 19 . . B-R3 20 P-N5 or $19 \ldots$ B-Q2 20 N -B5 etc.

## 19 BxB

N-B3
Again not 19 . . N-B5 because of 20 $\mathrm{BxN}, \mathrm{PxB} 21 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ ! and $22 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 6$.

$$
20 \text { P-N5 N-N1 }
$$

The idea of a Pawn sacrifice: $20 \ldots$ N-R4 21 Q-R4, O-O 22 B-K1, N-B5 23 $\mathrm{BxN}, \mathrm{PxB}$, to retain Black's Q4 for his Knight fails, because of $24 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 5$ ? 21 Q-R4!


Now anyone can see Black is lost. His Queen is so badly placed there is no defense against the main threat of B-K1-R5.
$21 \ldots$
O-O

The text is better than $21 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 1$ at once as 22 . . . P-QR4 23 PxP e.p. Q-R2 leaves White's King Rook out of play.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
22 \ldots \ldots \\
23 & \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 8!
\end{array} \quad \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 1
$$

Now, if $23 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q1}$ :

| 23 | N-B2 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $24 \mathrm{RxR} \dagger$ | K×R |
| 25 B-K1 |  |

The great peril, B-R5, now impends.

| 25 |  | P-QR4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 26 | PxP e.p. | Q-R2 |
|  | Q-N3! |  |

Of course, 27 RxP fails, A combinative way of winning is 27 Q-B2, and 1) 27 . . N/2xP 28 BxP! PxB 29 QxP†. K-N। $30 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{QB} 8 \frac{1}{1}$ and 31 RxP ; or 2) 27. $\mathrm{N} / 1 \mathrm{xP}$ etc. and $30 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 7, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 131 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 5$, B-Q1 32 P-K6, Q-N1 33 Q-B7ヶ etc.

The text wins positionally by chok. ing the Black pieces.

$$
27 \ldots \quad P \times P
$$

$\dagger=$ check; $\ddagger=$ dbl. check; $!=$ dis. oh.


A critical battle: Suetin (White) vs. Polugayevsky

$$
28 \text { Q-N7 N-Q2 }
$$

Black cannot exchange Queens: $28 \ldots$ QxQ $29 \mathrm{RxQ}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 430 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 631$ RxB, KxR 32 B-N4t.

## 29 B-R5

All White's pieces penetrate, and Black can no longer avoid the loss of material.

| 29 |  | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 4$ | 34 | R-QB1 | Q×Q |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 30 | Q-B6! | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | 35 | R×Q | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{R} 6$ |
| 31 | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$ ! | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | 36 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B7}$ | K-K1 |
| 32 | B-QN6 | Q-N1 | 37 | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B} \dagger$ | K $\times$ R |
| 33 | B-Q3 | Q-B1 | 38 | B-B5 $\dagger$ | Resigns |

## PIRC DEFENSE

A quick draw was expected in this game but, instead, there was a long and hard fight.
A. Suetin
L. Polugayevsky
Soviet Union Soviet Union White Black

| 1 | P-K4 | P-KN3 | $3 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB3} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | $4 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $\ldots$ |

$4 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ is more aggressive and pretentious, but the text is better.
4....

P-QB3
Black aims to attack as soon as possi. ble on the Queenside and to oppose White's advantage in the center. Hypermodern, but probably not good. On classical theory, Black must develop pieces and oppose in the center.

```
5 Q-Q2!
```

As in the Dragon Variation in the Sicilian, White aims for B-KR6 at the first opportunity. Black's Knight cannot cower forever on KN1.
5 ...
P-QN4
Q-R4
$7 \mathrm{KN}-\mathrm{K} 2$ Q-R4
. . .

This Knight may maneuver N-B1-N3 to throw back Black's Queen, as in the

Closed Sicilian and the Saemisch Variation of the King's Indian, and often in modern openings, proving we have no single, independent ones, but all are tied together.
$\begin{array}{lrrrr}7 \ldots & \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 2 & 9 & \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3 & \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2 \\ 8 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 1 & \mathrm{KN}-\mathrm{B} 3 & 10 & \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 6 & \end{array}$
Comparing this position with corresponding ones in the Dragon, White has a large plus. Black has no counterplay on the Queen Bishop file, and White al. ready has active, King-side play. Black's opening idea has proved ineffective.

```
10 ...NR4 O-O
```

It is difficult to suggest better for Black. At least, he is constrained to tend to the center and the defense of his King. Queen-side Pawn pushes lead to nothing good, only toward propelling White's Knight nearer to the Kingside.

12 P-R5
B×B

"You have a beautiful combination there-a bit unsound, but Haggerty'd never be able to spot the flaw . . ."

Hardly 12 ．．NxRP 13 RxN，PxR 14 Q－N5．

13 Q×B
$\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 3$
Black clears a King－side approach for his Queen．13 ．．NxRP 14 P－N4， N／4－B3 15 B－K2 leaves Black helpless against $16 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 5 . \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{R} 417 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ ！etc．

14 P－R4


Unseemly－White＇s chances are on the Kingside，and he begins to play on the Queenside！It is a hard moment in the game for White：he has not seen how to continue with the attack and begins to wander．

14 Q－N5 ：is correct，to tie Black＇s Queen down： $14 \ldots$ ． $2-\mathrm{K} 2$ ，and，after $15 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-0$ ，White has a position in which he can continue the attack．

## QNPxP

Black misses his chance and incurs a positional disadvantage． $14 \ldots$ B－K3 is correct，threatening $15 \ldots$ BxN and 16 ．．．KPxP．On 15 QPxP，QPxP 16 $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 5$ ，he has a playable position．

15 NxP
B－K3
16 QPxP
Now white constructs a strong post for a Knight on QB5．

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
16 \ldots & Q P \times P \\
17 \mathrm{~N} / 4-\mathrm{B} 5 & \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{RP}
\end{array}
$$

17．．B－B1，if it must be played， is better at least with a Pawn more．

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
18 \text { P-KN4 } & \text { N-B3 } \\
19 \text { Q-N5 } & \text { K-N2 }
\end{array}
$$

Black cannot hold the Pawn and ought rather to give it back at once．He pays for the delay by worsening his Pawn formation．On 19 ．．．Q－K2 20 QxKP， QN－Q2 21 Q－N 5 ，KR－K1，White＇s advan． tage is not so decisive as in the game．

$$
\begin{array}{lrr}
20 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{B} \dagger & \mathrm{P} \times N \\
21 & \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 5 & \text { QR-K1 }
\end{array}
$$

Or $21 \ldots$ ．$Q-Q 322$ P－N4！with the threat of $23 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ ．

| 22 | N－R6 | Q－B2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 23 | QxKP | K－N1 |
| 24 | Q－N3 | $\ldots$. |

On 24 B－K2，Black can win： $24 \ldots$ ． NxNP！ $25 \mathrm{PxN}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 7 \div 26 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 1, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1 \dagger$ $27 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 6 \div 28 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 5 \dagger$.
$24 .$.
N／B－Q2

As Black＇s Pawns are weak，he ought to avoid simplifying．Hence， 25 ．．．Q－N2 is better．
（See diagram，top of next column）
26 Q－R4！
White＇s best chance；after swapping Queens，he can attack all three Black


Position after $25 \ldots$ Q－B3
＂separatist＂Pawns as he will，and with－ out danger of attack．

$$
26 \ldots \quad Q \times Q \dagger
$$

On $26 \ldots$ Q－N2，White wins with $27 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 7, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 228 \mathrm{RxP}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 429 \mathrm{NxP}$ ： 27 RXQ

R－B2
27 ．．．N－K4 is a bit better． 28 R－QR5
White begins the roundup of the Black Pawns．

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
28 \ldots . \ldots & R-Q B 1 \\
29 \text { P-N4 }
\end{array}
$$

White prevents $29 \ldots$ P－B4．

| 29 | R－K1 | 32 K－Q2 | R－Q2 $\dagger$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 30 | R－KR1 | R－Q1 | 33 K－K3 | R－Q3 |
| 31 | R－QB5 | R－B1 | 34 | R－QR5 |$\ldots .$.

White vacates QB5 for his Knight or even for $P-Q B 4-5$ ．

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
34 \ldots & \text { R-Q2 } \\
35 \text { N-B5 } & \text { R-K2 } \\
36 \text { P-KN5 } & \ldots . .
\end{array}
$$

Now Black＇s King Rook Pawn has be－ come a fourth target，and Black can touch nothing in White＇s position．
$\begin{array}{llll}36 \ldots & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4 & 38 & \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 6 \\ \mathrm{~B} & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3 \\ 37 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1 & \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 2 & 39 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} \dagger & \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P}\end{array}$
This is a＂Purdy＂picture for those who know：Black＇s Pawns are so many ＂islands，＂all subjectable to attack． White＇s Pawns are connected and un－ touchable．It follows，White＇s pieces are all attacking；Black＇s，tied to defending．

$$
\begin{array}{llllr}
40 & \text { B-R6 } & \mathrm{R} / 1-\mathrm{B} 2 & 42 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4 \\
41 & \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 3 & \mathrm{~N} / 1-\mathrm{N} 2 & 43 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5 \\
& & \mathrm{~N} / 3-\mathrm{Q} 2 \\
& & 44 & \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4 & \cdots
\end{array}
$$

Black is mired deeper and deeper．

| $44 . \ldots$ | K－N2 | 46 | R－KN1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 45 R－R1 | R－N2 | 47 | P－B4！ |
|  | $\ldots .$. |  |  |

Here is the deciding maneuver．Black is practically without moves，can no longer protect his King Knight Pawn and faces complete stalemate of his forces because of White＇s ensuing passed King Pawn．

| 47 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} \dagger$ | $56 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| $48 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ | $57 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ |  |
| $49 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$ | $\mathrm{R} / 2-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $58 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |  |
| $50 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$ | $59 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KN} 1$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 2$ |  |
| $51 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 2$ | 60 | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P} \dagger$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 2$ |
| $52 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KN} 1$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | $61 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB} 2$ |  |
| $53 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 2$ | 62 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 4$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| $54 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB} 1$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | $63 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |  |
| $55 \mathrm{R} / 6-\mathrm{B} 6$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 6 \dagger$ | $64 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 6!$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QN} 2$ |  |

$63 . . \mathrm{RxN} \ddagger$ is to no avail： 64 RxR ， $\mathrm{NxP} \dagger 65 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 5, \mathrm{NxR} 66 \mathrm{KxN}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 367$ $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 5, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 268 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ etc．
$\begin{array}{lrlrr}65 & \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 5 & \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P} & 67 & \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 6\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{r}\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P} \dagger \\ 66 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 7\end{array} \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 2 \dagger \quad 68 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B7} \quad \begin{aligned} & \text { Resigns }\end{aligned}$

## YOU ARE IN ZUGZWANG1

．．．if you do not know the give－ and－take of chess strategy．．．． What，for example，is the value of center control？Or how weak is an isolated Pawn 盆，or a doubled Pawn $\frac{t}{t}$ ？How strong is an outpost Knight $\begin{array}{ll}\text { or a salient } \frac{\pi}{3} \text { 分 盆，or a } \\ \text { reverse salient } & \text { ？}\end{array}$ Or the more than thirty char－ acteristic features of Pawn and Piece structures？
．．．if you are constantly in a muddle as to what to do，and your play is planless，pointless－ plain shiftless，
Then you need POINT COUNT CHESS by I．A．Horowitz and Geoffrey Mott－Smith．These two champions have collaborated to bring you an entirely new， simple approach to the ever－re－ curring problems of chess strate－ gy．They have defined，described and appraised via a POINT COUNT all the effective，stra－ tegic ideas of the great masters． When you have read this book， you will no longer treat an iso－ lated Pawn I merely as an unimportant detail or hanging Pawns $\frac{\pi}{\Omega} \frac{\pi}{\Omega}$ with a bored ＂let＇em hang．＂You will see these as plans，plans to inflict weaknesses on your opponent and to avoid for yourself．Simi－ larly，you will see all structures as plans，and you，yourself，will be able to evaluate them．You will learn when to accept weak－ nesses，when not to．
In short，by counting the plus and minus points involved in every move，you will become an expert trader，an expert chess player．And you can see how the masters have done so in many，complete，illustrative games．Your move is to get your copy of Point Count Chess， today． 340 pages ．．．．．．$\$ 4.95$ 1．Zugzwang（German，compul－ sion to move）the situation of a player whose moves are so re－ stricted that any move he chooses will impair his defense seriously or fatally．
84 other useful chess terms，from ＂advanced group＂to＂Zwischen－ zug＂are defined and described in this work．
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## ZAGREB 1965 <br> Bent Larsen - He Who Lives by the Sword

One of the outstanding talents in the non-Russian chess-playing world is that of the young and gifted Dane, Bent Larsen. His play is always inventive and original, and he has justly earned the reputation of shunning the "grandmaster draw" and playing for a win at all costs. Unlike the even more famous Dane, Hamlet, Larsen is never indecisive. His policy has in the past made him an "in and outer." He is capable of winning any chess tournament as is evidenced by his magnificent showing in the Amsterdam Interzonal Tournament in which he tied for first and richly earned his place in the forthcoming challengers matches, but he is also capable of mediocre and less than mediocre results, often as a result of excessive striving for originality and experimentation which backfires. His play in his coming match with Boris Ivkov will be watched keenly by chess lovers the world over. Meanwhile, the following two games offer an opportunity to appraise the virtues and defects of his style.

In this game, we see Larsen scoring effectively against the strong defensive player Aleksandar Matanovich.
The opening starts placidly enough with a solid Catalan. In the hands of lesser players, this usually peters out to a placid, early draw; but, in this instance, just as it appears that Black has circumvented all his difficulties, White unleashes a surprising combination to force the win.

CATALAN SYSTEM
(By Transposition)

| Bent Larsen |  | A. Matanovich <br> Denmark |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Yugoslavia |  |  |  |  |

Thus, by a common sequence, a normal transposition to the Catalan has been achieved. White exerts some pressure on Black's center, and Black also has the problem of developing his Queen Bishop; his problems are not insurmountable, merely annoying.

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
6 \ldots \because & \text { QN-Q2 } \\
7 \text { QN-Q2 } & P-B 3
\end{array}
$$

Black's is a solid continuation which will enable him to achieve a near equality. 7 . . P-QN3 is also playable and, in some variations gains a tempo over the text. The point is that White can-
not easily avail himself of the temporary weakness of Black's Queen Bishop Pawn as his own Queen Knight is posted passively.

| 8 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 3$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 9 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ |
| 10 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |



11 P-K3
This move is played not so much to bolster White's center as to provide a square for his Queen. The positioning of the Queens is something of a problem for both sides. Alternately, the maneuvers, $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2-\mathrm{N} 1$ and $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$ followed by Q-R1 or $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 1$ have been tried for both White and Black.

| $11 \ldots$ | $P \times P$ | 15 KxB | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B4}$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| $12 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $16 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 4 \dagger$ |
| $13 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $17 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ |
| $14 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{QP}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $18 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 2$ |
| $\dagger=$ check; $\ddagger=$ dbl. check; $\xi=$ dis. ch. |  |  |  |

White still holds the advantage as a result of the better position of his minor pieces and his firm hold on the center. Naturally, Black will try to ease his position by judicious exchanges.

19 N-K5
B-B1
Black's is a good defensive move. It is useful in that, if white ever plays N-QB6, this Bishop is not subject to attack.
$20 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$


This is another good move. 20
$\mathrm{N} / 3-Q 2$ is a mistake because of 21 N/4-B6: e.g. $21 \ldots$ RxN? 22 NxR. QxN $23 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 4$; or 21 . . R-K1 $22 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 4$, NxN 23 NxN, N-R5 or N-R3 $24 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 7$ etc.
21 R/1-QB1 N/3-Q2 23 P-QR3 N/3-N1 $22 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 4 \quad \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 3 \quad 24 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 4$

With this and his next move, White gives Black an opportunity to shake off the annoying pressure. White ought to play $24 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 4$. The virtue in a prophylactic measure of this kind will soon become apparent.
$\begin{array}{lrrr}24 . & P-Q R 3 & 26 \text { QxR } & P-Q N 4 \\ 25 \text { Q-B2 } & R \times R & 27 Q-B 3 & P-N 5\end{array}$

Black's maneuvering is excellent. Now he can obtain counterplay against the White Pawn on QN3.

| 28 P×P | $B \times P$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| 29 Q-K3 | $B-K 2$ |
| 30 R-B4 | $R-Q B 1$ |

Now, however, Matanovich falters. He overlooks a clever continuation. Correct is 30 . . P-KR4 $31 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 4$ after which he ought to be able to hold his own.
(See diagram, top of next column)
31 NXP !
Very neat indeed!
$31 .$.
$R \times R$


Position after 30... R-QB1
On $31 \ldots$ PxN, 32 Q-B3 threatening mate at KN7 costs Black his Rook. Probably, Black's best here is 31 B-B1 and, if 32 NxB? RxR. But White can play simply $32 \mathrm{RxR}, \mathrm{QxR} 33 \mathrm{NxB}$ and, with an extra Pawn and a fine position to boot, he will win in the long rum.
$32 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 6 \dagger$
Resigns
On 32
PxN 33 QxP, R-B7t 34 $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 135 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 5$ 中 or 34 . . B-B3 35 BxB , mate follows. On $32 \ldots \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$, 33 BxP is mate.

All in all, a beautiful and original combination.

In the following game, White is the benefliciary of a careless opening se-quence-or a faulty experiment by Lar-sen-which enables him to engineer a virulent attack. When Black subsequent. ly defends inaccurately, playing the wrong Knight to B3, he falls victim to a "Larsen-like" combination.

## ROBATSCH DEFENSE

Arthur B. Bisguier
Bent Larsen United States

Denmark
1 P-Q4 P-KN3 $4 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3 \quad \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$
2 P-K4 B-N2 5 B-Q3 O-O
3 P-KB4 P-Q3 6 O-O QN-Q2
Thanks to a rather unusual opening sequence, White has managed to avoid playing N-QB3. Hence, he has the opportunity of starting a direct attack which immediately threatens to become decisive.


## 7 P-K5

This thrust is necessary as Black is threatening to obtain a satisfactory game with 7 . . . P-K4: e.g. $7 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ \& BPxP, PxP 9 PxP, N/2xP 10 NxN. Q-Q5 $\div 11 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1, \mathrm{QxN} / 4$ with a good position.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
7 \ldots \mathrm{~K} i & \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 1 \\
8 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Ki}
\end{array}
$$

This fine move bears overtones of 9 Q-R4 and 9 P-K6.

$$
8 \ldots \quad P-Q B 4
$$

Naturally, 8 . . . P-K3, though safer, is very mappetizing and leaves Black with considerable positional disadvantages. The text is his only chance for comnterplay.


9 P-B5
This advance leads to a strong attack at the expense of two Pawns. There are other tempting, strong continuations available: e.g. 9 P-K66! PxP $10 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5$, $\mathrm{BxP} \dagger$ ? $11 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 212 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ 13 P-B3, P-B5 14 NxRP, NxN 15 BxNP. Probably, 10 . . N-B2 11 Q-R4, N-B3 12 PxP, PxP is best for both sides. Then, though White has positional advantage, Black has fair chances.
9 Q-R4 also deserves consideration.

```
9... P\timesKP
```

Other continuations are definitely inferior: e.g. 9 . PxBP 10 BxP on which White is mmediately operating with such threats as $11 \mathrm{BxP} \uparrow$ and 12 N-N5 $\dagger$; or $9 .$. PXQP $10 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 6$, PxKP 11 PxNP with an overwhelming White position.

## $10 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{NP}$

Here and next turn, 10 PxKP is not good because of 10 . . NxP 11 NxN , Q-Q5 $\dagger$ as Black ought to win after recapturing his piece.

| $10 \ldots$ | RP×P |
| :--- | :--- |
| 11 Q-R 4 | KP×P |
| 12 B-KR6 | $\ldots$. |

$12 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5$ also leads to a promising attack, but it seemed to white that the attack is stronger with Black's good de. fensive Bishop removed.

$$
12 \ldots \quad N / 1-B 3
$$

This move definitely loses. Black has defensive chances if he plays the other Knight to B3 as is soon very obvious.
$13 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5$
$\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 4$

## CHESS and CHECKERS Supplies

High Quality Catalln and Plastic Checkers Plain or Grooved. . All Slizes
CHESS Sets . . . Wood . . Catalin . . 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 Heights, Ohio 44121

It may be that Black had intended 13 . . . N-R4 but then discovered it loses to $14 \mathrm{BxB}, \mathrm{KxB} 15 \mathrm{RxP} \dagger$ as $15 \ldots \mathrm{RxR}$ $16 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 6 \dagger$ wins Black's Queen. As a matter of fact, White was threatening 14 BxP, PxB $15 \mathrm{BxB}, \mathrm{KxB} 16 \mathrm{~N}$-K6\%. The vulnerability of Black's K3 is the rea. son the Knight on Q2 ought to have gone to B3 on Black's twelfth turn.


[^3]B-R1
Hereabouts, all the moves have the look of problem composition. Undoubtedly, Larsen overlooked 14 RxN, thinking 14 . . . BxR a sufficient answer, but later noticed that then $15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 7$ ? forces mate at either KR7 or KR8.

The fantastic 14 . . . B-R1 is the only chance to fight on for awhile as 14 $\ldots$ N-N5 is met simply by $15 \mathrm{BxB}, \mathrm{KxB}$ 16 RxBP $\dagger, \mathrm{RxR} 17 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 7 \mathrm{t}$, K-B3 18 NxR winning the Queen since White also threatens 19 QxP mate.

15 R-B1
Here $15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 7$ is no longer convincing as Black has 15 . . . KxB with KB3 as his "out" square.

15 ....
R-K1
Once again, White threatened $16 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 7$ as well as 16 BxR.


16 B-B8:
This is both a clearance and a block. ing move. White clears a path for his Queen and forces Black to block his escape square.

$$
16 \ldots \quad \text { B-B3 }
$$

Else, $17 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 7 \dagger$ and 18 QxB mate. 17 RxB !
The Rook returns to the conquering KB6 square.

| $17 . \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 6$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| 18 | $\ldots$ |

The coup de grace.
$18 \ldots \quad$ R×B
Having played on this long, Black generously allows:

19 Q-R7 mate

By WILLIAM LOMBARDY International Grandmaster

## THE CHESSPLAYER'S DILEMMA: THE UNEXPECTED

What is the unknown? The far reaches of outer space, the mathematical $N$, the depths of the sea, the whirlings of the human mind, the parched expanse of the Sahara and even a car trip-without a road map. We live in a complex world in which, more often than not, much of the significance behind these myriads of detail escapes our puny grasp. No less is this so in the chess arena, where the master is the master mainly because, fortunately, his intuition and imagination, and sometimes his powers of calculation, have developed to a fine point. He maintains his status only by remaining alert at the crucial moment when an accurate countdown for a winning coup is required.

Almost nothing can be predicted with any certainty in Chess, the most erratic of games. Try your hand at the headaches which accompany a tournament game: the weather, the colorful habits of an opponent, sinusitis, the tournament director-have you ever been forfeited because your wily opponent overstepped the time limit?-the clock! the opening, the endgame and on and on and on. Need one elaborate further? Conveniently combining all these unknowns and those purposely omitted, the Swiss Tournament, THE unknown in Chess, is by overwhelming consensus the bane of chessplayer and tournament director alike-so you see, the writer actually does feel for the tournament director.

THE SCENE is the $1964 \mathrm{U} . \mathrm{S}$. Open Championship at Boston, Massachusetts, Round 2. Already a couple of minutes late, the narrator washed down that last cup of coffee and, not necessarily as quickly as possible, made his way to the tournament site. More than lucky to have won in the first round, he was painfully aware he was still not quite prepared for this round. Possession of a grim determination to win is no guarantee of victory, but that possession would have to do.
He entered unobtrusively-if that's possible for a grandmaster of high cali-ber-and focused on the dais at the far end of the room. Momentarily interrupted and pleasantly surprised by a plea for an autograph from a young enthusiast, he signed on the dotted line and again cast his glance to where streams of light were cascading onto large demonstration boards easily seen
from every angle of the room. On one of them appropriately appended placards announced: "White, RAUCH vs. Black, LOMBARDY. Other important games were in progress; but, wondering who Mr. Rauch might be, the writer was too pre-occupied to pay them much attention. As it turned out, "Mr. Rauch" was Dr. Joseph Rauch, a player of unusual talent and determination and whose acquaintance, apparently, the writer had already made during one of his stays in Canada. Gesturing sincere but absentminded greetings, he proceeded toward his board.

The demonstration board had already indicated Rauch's first play.

## 1 N-KB3

No wonder the writer was muffled in thought. When he finally arrived at the table, the opponents clasped hands in a sporting gesture. Interesting, Rauch's

It is precisely this bane, however, which adds the flavor and enjoyment for the thousands of American Swiss Tournament goers. Mystery inevitably tantalizes; for there is a challenge to be surmounted, a gamble to be won. And if ever there were a gamble -poker, Chess, roulette (Russian?), dog races, cribbage, all are incorporated in the pairing methods connected with the Swiss System-then here we have one. Under this system, guessing correctly one's successive opponents could be the key to victory. Unlike the round-robin affair where one knows when one will meet whom, hopefully when one is feeling chipper, the Swiss pairings add the element of surprise. One must be keyed for the race, prepared to encounter absolutely anything: the latest analysis from abroad, even a home-brewed concoction, a strong player in top form (even in melancholia he could provide anxious moments) and, most dangerous of all, the so-called weaker player who has summoned all his energies in one courageous will to hold a titan at bay. Are you prepared for anything? Now there's a challenge!

## Men must be taught as if you taught them not And things unknown proposed as things forgot.

Frankly, one's own insights do not always remain on the conscious level. Is this another way of saying that the master is often caught off-guard, unprepared?
hand was moist-as the writer's had been before he'd mopped it with a handkerchief to cover his nervousness. The confidence which comes with the knowledge that one's opponent is similarly unnerved prompted him to make a speedy reply to the first thrust.

$$
1 \ldots \quad P-Q B 4
$$

This move commits Black to a plan readily anticipated by a serious student of the game, a type of King's Indian De. fense. That it very definitely limits White's subsequent choices establishes: its merit. White may either transpose into a Sicilian with $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$-something one who plays $1 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ is not likely to relish-or he may adopt a closed type of English Opening, the passive character of which could suit only a timid nature.

Anyway, the ensuing moves were not essayed with much deliberation on either
side. They are probably book. But then what is book, particularly when the moves are forced by reflex actions of the right arm? There is a pertinent parallel remark by a well known author: "The bookful blockhead, ignorantly read, with loads of learned lumber in his head."
2 P-KN3 P-KN3 4 B-N2 N-QB3 3 P-QB4 B-N2 $5 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3^{*} \quad .$.

Up to this point, the narrator found distraction in employing the symbol $Z$ instead of N in representing the Knight on his score sheet. He had previously seen the reputable U. S. Senior Master, Charles Kalme, use the Latvian system of notation which incorporates the $z$ (which very likely does not stand for "zip") and told Charlie he would use that symbol for variety's sake. It certainly reflects his ill-preparedness that he sought such frivolous diversion at such a time.

In an attempt to gain the initiative, Black proceeded with a routine but unoriginal line.

| $5 \ldots$ | P-QR3 |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 6 O-O | R-N1 |  |
| 7 | P-QR4 | $\ldots .$. |

As the original plan was stymied by White's last move, normal developing moves followed.

$0-0$

Rather than properly avoiding the exchange of the valuable King Bishop, Black thought it more logical to press what he was later to recognize as an imaginary initiative. True, the text nets a small advantage; but it is so miniscule that a resulting victory for Black might be termed purely accidental. On the other hand, Black's position is organically much more sound. So complications should have been preferred and exchanges avoided, at least for the moment.

## 11 B-R6

White rightly did not allow the feint to disturb him. If he was to eliminate Black's King Bishop he could not delay,

| 11 | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N}$ | 13 BxB | $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $12 \mathrm{~B} / 2 \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ | $14 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 3$ | $\cdots$ |

To defend against . . . N-N6, White accepted a minor weakening of his Pawn structure-so far all according to Black's plan.

[^4]14 15 PxN $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{B} \dagger$
$$
\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 1
$$

At least for the moment, White had greater space owing to his control of the available open lines, But Black's Knight intended to elbow its way to Q5, at the slight risk of leaving the Kingside open to attack, to neutralize that space advantage.

| $16 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $17 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 4 ?!$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| $18 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ |



Fortunately, Black had conceded no weakening in his Pawn structure, e.g. by ... P-K4. For, in such case, White could have sought equality with 19 $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 2$ and, on 19 . . N-B4, $20 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ would have offered White excellent prospects as White's Queen Rook so long out of play would readily have found action at Q3 or QN3.

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
19 & \text { R-R4 } & \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 4 \\
20 & \text { R-R3 } & \ldots . .
\end{array}
$$

White decided to persist; for if 20 R-K4, P-K3 $21 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ ! Black would easily have had the upper hand.

| $20 \ldots$... | R-KR1 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 21 P-KN4 | N-Q5 |
| 22 Q-R6 $\dagger$ | K-N1 |

Black knew the position of his King Rook would be no drawback for these reasons: (1) White could not open the position owing to his immobile and weak Pawn structure: (2) neither of White's Rooks were strategically placed; and (3) White had to leave his Queen out of play at R6 in order to bolster his mythical onslanght.

$$
23 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4
$$

P-B4:
This move, settling the Kingside, served to fix White's Pawns and to deprive his Knight of K4.

$$
24 \text { P-N5 }
$$

P-K3!
Black's King Pawn was open to attack along the file, but the attack would have been long in coming and parried with no difficulty if it came. The aim of the text was to further limit White's Knight.

$$
\begin{array}{cc}
25 & R-R 1 \\
26 & R-K 1
\end{array} \quad \text { Q-N3? }
$$

(See diagram, top of next column)
Unfortunately as must be honestly ad. mitted, Black had not pondered long enough to realize the potential of this last move. Now white had sufficient compensation for his weaknesses.
$\ddagger=$ check $; \ddagger=$ dbl check; $\S=$ dis. ch.

$26 \ldots$ QxP would have been met by 27 $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ and $28 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 6 \mathrm{t}$, or $27 \ldots$ PxN? 28 R-K7 etc. Should Black nevertheless have played $26 \ldots$ QxP? There might have followed: $27 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q7} 28 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 6 \dagger$. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 229 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 4$ ? (other moves also open attacking possibilities for White) $30 \mathrm{QxRP} \dagger$ ! RxQ $31 \mathrm{RxR} \uparrow, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Bl}$ R/3-R3! Apparently not, for checkmate would indeed have been difficult to avoid. The best course open for Black after $26 \ldots$ QxP $27 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ would have been to proceed with $27 \ldots$ K-B2 28 N-B6, QR-N1 $29 \mathrm{NxR}, \mathrm{KxN}$ and, with the Exchange down, to rely on the cumbersome position of White's Queen.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
26 \ldots-\mathrm{K} 2 \\
27 & \text { Q-B2 }
\end{array}
$$

Black thought then and still does that White's best was $27 \mathrm{R} / 3-\mathrm{K} 3$ with the threats of sacrificing the Exchange at K6 or the Knight at Q5 ever imminent, He planned 27 . . Q Q-N2 in reply, forcing an exchange of Queens as 28 Q-R4. P-KR3! allows Black a slight intiative.

```
27....
Q-B3 \(\dagger\)
28 P-B3
...
```

Now White's King Rook is permanently bottled in.

$28 \ldots \times N$ | $N \times N$ |
| ---: |
| $29 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{K} 1$ |


$30 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 3$
A sad choice. White still had a fighting chance to save the game with 30 $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3$. For, on 30 . . . Q-N3 $31 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4$ ! QxP, he would have had $32 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 1, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ 33 Q-QR1!
. . as he was valiant, I honour him; but, as he was ambitious, I slew him. Verily, though, the procedure required some technique.

$$
30 \ldots \quad Q \times R P!
$$

My Kingdom for a Pawn.

| 31 | P-R4 | Q-Q2 | 35 | R/2-N2 | R/R-N1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 32 | P-R5 | Q-N2 | 36 | K-K2 | P-K4! |
| 33 | K-B1 | QxQ | 37 | PxKP | P×KP |
| 34 | P×Q | K-B2 | 38 | R-N5 | R-K3 |

## Sevt <br> spotitight on <br> QUEEN'S GAMBIT: Two Knights Variation

by DR. MAX EUWE

In chess, one often hears of "rules and laws," meaning not the rules of the game but rather maxims, indications and directives to facilitate the choice of moves.

Some such are "One should control the center." "One should advance his Pawns on the wing against which his Bishop is directed." "If you have the better development, try to open the game." Some of these have general validity; others, the "if" maxims, are valid only under certain conditions.

But can one speak of validity at all? Does one always control the center or always postpone castling if the wing Pawns have moved? Rather, we must state that maxims have only a general meaning. Sometimes, they work; sometimes, they don't. There are exceptions, and the clever player knows when to apply them and when not.

We can, however, phrase matters better. A maxim works generally; but, when two or more are simultaneously in the picture, it is a question of which is the stronger.

Some recent developments in the Queen's Gambit Accepted supply a typical example of the explanations given above.

White
Black

| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q4}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q4}$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB4} 4$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $3 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | $\ldots$. |

The natural-looking move is 3 P-K4 creating a broad center and attack. ing Black's Queen Bishop Pawn, But we know the text is necessary to stop the push, 3 . . . P-K4, which undermines or neutralizes White's center majority.

```
3....
N-KB3
\(4 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3\)
```



The text looks quite natural. Black's last move prevented 4 P-K4 and now White threatens $5 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$. But a crition point arises here.

It has been the maxim that White avoid early development of Queen Knight
to B3 as it may allow Black profitably to advance his Queen-side Pawns, ... P-QR3 and . . . P-QN4 and chase White's Knight. The implication is that K 4 is not too safely controlled by White.

So we have bifurcation: one maxim says: play N-QB3, another says: don't. The text has seldom been played. Whether it will be in the future turns on the outcome of analytical consequences. When two rules prescribe opposite strategies, tactical considerations must decide.

## 4....

## P-QR3

This is the consistent reply. If any argument can be raised against 4 N -B3, it must start with the maneuver ... $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$, . . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN4}$, threatening to drive off the Knight and followed possibly by . . . B-N2 controlling Black's K5. The plan seems somewhat laborious. But it must be remembered that White has to devote time to recovering the gambit Pawn.

As to other moves, here's a short survey:

1) 4 . . . P-B3 leads to the Slay Accepted;
2) $4 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 45 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 36 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$. PxP 7 P-K5! favors White: e.g. $7 \ldots$ N-K5 8 NxP, B-K3 9 BxP, Q-R $+\dagger 10$ $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{NxB} 11 \mathrm{QxN}, \mathrm{QxQ} \dagger 12 \mathrm{KxQ}$;
3) 4

QN-Q2 5 P-K4, N-N3 6 P-QR4, P-QR4 7 N-K5, P-B3 \& NxP favors White slightly (Najdorf-Reshev. sky, Buenos Aires 1953);
4) 4 . . . N-B3 is satisfactory for Black: 5 P-Q5, N-QR4 6 Q-R4 +P , B 3 7 P-QN4, P-QN4! 8 QxN, QxQ 9 PxQ. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 5$ and 10 ... PxP+; or $5 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$, B-N5 6 BxP. P-K3 7 B-N5, B-N5 8 Q-R4, BxKN 9 PxB, Q-Q3.

## 5 P-K4

5 Q-R4 $\dagger$ is bad on account of $5 \ldots$ $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 46 \mathrm{NxP}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$.
$5 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR4} 4, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 36 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 57 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$, P-K4! \& PxP, N-Q2 $9 \mathrm{BxP}, \mathrm{N} / 3 \times \mathrm{P}$, and Black stands well.

| $5 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN4}$ |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| $6 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q4}$ |



## 7 P-QR4

This is the right way to break up the Black Pawn formation.

7... B-N2 8 P-K6 may lead to the text variation.

$$
8 \mathrm{PxN}
$$



By 8... Q Q4. Black can prevent the powerful 9 p-K6, but it is doubtful that he attains full equality. A game. Bronstein-Korchnoy (Moscow 1964) ran: $9 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 210 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{KN} 2, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 211 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{QR} 3$,

P-K3 $12 \mathrm{BxB}, \mathrm{KxB} 13 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 314$ N-R4, and White gradually got the better game.

## 9 P-K6!

PxKP
9 . . . P-KB3 occurred in BronsteinR. Byrne (Helsinki 1952). After 10 P-N3. Q-Q4 11 B-KN2. QxPt $12 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$. P-B3 13 O-O, Q-B1. Black could hold his own. 10 B-K2! however, gives white a promising attack: 10 . Q-Q4 11 O-O, QxKP $12 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 4, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 113 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 4$ etc. $10 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$
The altemative $10 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} t$ does not offer the same chances as the text. 10.

Q-Q4


## 11 N -N5!

The text is much stronger than 11 $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 212 \mathrm{BxP} / 7, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 313 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$, B-N2 14 R-K1, P-K4 15 BxP, NxB 16 PxN, O-O with a good game for Black (Taimanov-Novopachin).

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
11 \ldots \text { R } & \text { Q×NP } \\
12 \text { R-Bi } & B-Q 4
\end{array}
$$

12 . . QxRP 13 NxKP, Q-Q3 14 P-Q5! leaves Black dangerously locked in: $14 \ldots$ BxP 15 QxB!


In this remarkable position, White has the choice of several promising moves.

Variation 1

| 13 P×P | P×P |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 14 R×R | B×R |  |
| 15 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3$ |

Or 15 . . . N-R3 16 Q-R1 [not 16 NxKP, Q-K5], B-N2 17 Q-R5, K-Q2 18 N-B7, R-N1 19 QxNPt etc.


## Variation 2

(Continue from last diagram) $13 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 4$

P-R3
13 $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 5$ is preferable.

| 14 | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | BxN | 18 | PxP | BP×P |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15 | BxB | Q-K5 $\dagger$ | 19 | B-Q5 | R-QR2 |
| 16 | Q-K2 | QxQ $\dagger$ | 20 | B-B4 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| 17 | K×Q | P-B3 | 21 | KR- |  |

White is for choice.

## Variation 3

(Continue from last diagram) 13 B-B4
White poses the terrible threat of trapping Black's Queen: $14 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 4$ and 15 B-R3.


$$
13 \ldots \text { P-N5! }
$$

This surprising counter blow is def. initely stronger than 13 ... $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 314$ $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 4, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 315 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3, \mathrm{QxR} \dagger 16 \mathrm{BxQ}$, PxN as in Borisenko-Stein (Moscow 1965). That game ran: 17 BxBP, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 5$ ! 18 PxP, R-R5 19 P-N5, B-KN2 $20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 5$, $\mathrm{BxB} 21 \mathrm{PxB}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ with Black having the better chances. With 17 B-K5, however, White gains a decisive advantage: 17 . . . R-R5 18 PxP, PxP 19 RxR, BxR 20 Q-N1 etc.
$14 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 4$
Or $14 \mathrm{PxP}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$.

$$
14 \ldots \quad \text { P-R3 }
$$

The text is much stronger than $15 \ldots$ QxR\%.

| 16 | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Q}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 17 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 4$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B3}$ |
| 18 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\ldots$. |

Pire considers $18 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$ stronger.

| 18 | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{NP}$ | 20 | R-B1 | R-K5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $19 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | R-R5 | 21 | R-B3 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q6t}$ |
|  |  | 22 | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{N}$ |  |

Or $22 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 5$.

| $22 \ldots \mathrm{Q}$ | $\mathrm{P} \quad \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| 23 | $\mathrm{P}-K 4$ |



In this position, Polugayevsky and Szabo (Budapest 1965) agreed to a draw. But it seems Black has the betier of it: PxP, P-K3.

A most peculiar position.

## Oh! Kin Ah Win?

Our servicemen in the Ryukyus keep plugging away at chess and come up with occasional gems. Here's the latest at 10 seconds per move at the Kadena AFB Ohinawa USO.

## QUEEN PAWN COUNTER GAMBIT

## Manning

J. P. Kalish Black
1 P-K4 P-K4 3 PxP P-K5

2 N-KB3 P-Q4 4 N-K5 $\quad .$.
$4 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2$ is correct and gives White a positive advantage with best play.

| 4 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | 8 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{QN}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 5 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | 9 | $0-\mathrm{O}$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 4$ |
| 6 | $\mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{B} \dagger$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{N}$ | 10 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5$ |
| 7 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | 11 | Q-K1 | $\ldots$. |

It is clear White has lost too much time. Now Black settles the game in an attractive way.

$\qquad$ B-B6!
Actually, we prefer $11 \ldots$. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 6 \div 12$ PxN, BxP as 13 P-KR3, N-N5! 14 PxN. Q-KR3 and $13 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 5$ are decisive. 12 P-KR3
A vain attempt to meet one threat, 12 N (either)-N5. But White has no adequate defense: $12 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KN3}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ leads to mate; $12 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5$ can be countered simply by $12 \ldots \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$; and $12 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$, the best chance to throw Black off-stride, can be exemplified with $12 \ldots \mathrm{~N} / 4-\mathrm{N} 513 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3$, NxRP $14 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 215 \mathrm{KxN}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 5$ with a mate impending.
$12 \ldots$ N/3-N5! 14 P-KR4 P-KN4! 13 P-N3 Q-KR3 15 P-Q4

This move looks effective, but-

| $15 \ldots$ PxRP! |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| 16 | Pesigns |

It's mate by the lowly Pawn!

". . . now here's a little fifteen-minute shot the wife took of me the time I brought off a flashy draw with the state champion."

## CHESS ON THE COMPUTER

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

## Part III. - UNIVERSAL PROGRAMMING

In the previous article, it was assumed that the computer, programmed with the numerical system, would play a reasonable game. As seen, however, that supposition is only relatively true. Some times, the machine makes good moves and, some times, very bad ones, blinded, so to speak, by the glitter of the material. Equipped with numerical programming, the computer bases its decisions solely on materialistic relationships.

Cases in which the capture of material has been punished by mate are numerous. Witness, for example, the games of Anderssen and Morphy. They usually won brilliantly from weaker players, mostly by direct King-side attacks because their opponents had eyes only for capturing Pawns and pieces. If the machine is to be protected from these errors, there must be built in an instrument in the form of a supplemental programming which can measure and evaluate the attack on the Kingside.

The intention is as follows: if a player can capture, say, two Pawns for which the opponent obtains compensation in the form of a King-side attack, then it is important to know if that compensation equals or perhaps exceeds the gain in material.

It is not unusual to express the force of an attack on the King in terms of material. One often hears and reads that the attack "is worth a Pawn," or a piece. Thus, the problem is to set up a function uniting all factors which determine the force of the attack. Such function or evaluating formula, applied to the given position, represents the value of the attack.
Compilation of this (attack) function is, in the first instance, only theoretical: i.e. examination of the factors which are of importance in an attack on the King. The most obvious one is the resistance inherent in the King's position. When the Pawns before the King have been moved (some times, they are completely absent), then the King is less capable of withstanding attack. Another factor is the condition of squares near the King. When the Black King is on N1 and a White Bishop covers N2 and R1, that is, two squares adjacent to the King, that is surely significant toward success of the attack.

In this manner, a number of obvious factors can be lumped together in a formula. As their importance varies, they must be suitably weighted.

When a function has thus been formulated, it cannot be used without first testing it in application to a large num-
ber of appropriate positions, for corrections. Appropriate positions are those in which attack is the principal motif.
Thus, it is possible to arrive at a useful result, but complete satisfaction is not possible and was not expected. If by such methods the conclusion is that an attack is worth 1.4 Pawns, it hardly matters if the true value is perhaps 1.7 Pawns. It means only that one may be justified in sacrificing 1 Pawn to obtain the attack but probably not 2 Pawns.
In other words, the attack function or evaluation is not accurate nor does it need to be. It is a first approximation. In chess, nothing can be determined with absolute accuracy. So much depends on the position of all the Pawns and pieces on the board. The smallest change can affect the value of the attack. Hence, it serves to have a degree measurement for the force of the attack such that that force can be expressed in a number of Pawns or pieces.

The function or equation has perhaps been tested on a great number of prac. tical positions. But these are only a very small number of the possible positions. We must not be under the illusion that this function gives the correct result in all or in most cases. But it is usable as a first, rough approximation. Its use prevents the computer from concentrating solely on material. The function may give values such as -40 or -70 (a Pawn is 10). Then these figures, added to the values of the ordinary material in the normal computations, permit deviations from the dictates of a purely materialistic directive.
The procedure is to sum up for both sides the material on the board, expressed in figures, supplemented by the value of the attack function. The totals for each side determine the numerical value of the position which in turn is the basis for the choice of move. This system could be called "extended numerical chess pregramming."

It is obvious that other values, besides the King-side attack can be expressed in terms of material. Hence, it may be
hoped that a complete evaluation may be attained, to take into account all factors, material, combinational and positional.
There are objections, however, as, in comparison to material values, the values of other factors are small. With the value of a Pawn at 10 , something very special must be in hand before a Queen-side attack can equal that. As a rule, positional values will lie between 2 and 5 , that is, lower than the value of a Pawn. Some factors are: Queen-side attack, attack along an open or half-open file and attack on a well-posted piece, Values for this sort of factor are generally quite small and, what is worse, also inaccurate and subject to change. The variations are such that they overshadow the basic factors, and then there remains little to the total conception. New factors have to be taken into account constantly in any practical position. The posting of a Bishop may of itself be worth a Pawn on occasion, but then a small change in the position may reduce that value or wipe it out entirely.

So it is extremely difficult to take a stand on the basis of positional evaluation. In positions with equal material and no attack, the positional functions determine the choice of move. But, when such positional factors are small figures and not entirely reliable, it is very possible to start in the wrong direction. A very small change in the evaluation of certain factors would influence the decision perhaps in the opposite direction.

The euratom study group tried improving the playing level of computer chess by means of positional factors. But the idea was abandoned. It was often found that changes made in a somewhat unreliable function were canceled by other changes till the project appeared to be working in circles.
Chess is simply too complex. As mentioned before, all the men affect the character of the position. And even an apparently unimportant $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ can change a number of decisions.
The complexity is less of course in simpler games like checkers. The very fact that checkers move only along 32 squares makes the number of possibilities as to choices of moves much smaller than in chess. And the same is true even for Polish checkers ${ }^{1}$ with its 100 squares, or 50 in actual use. Besides, the moves of the men are much simpler.
In an extra issue of the magazine, Information, for the fourth birthday of the Study Center of the Foundation for Administrative Automation, there appear-

[^5]ed an article by Dr. Euwe, "Machine and Game." In it he relates how A. L. Samuel of New York developed an evaluation function or equation for checkers which rapidly improved the strength of the programming by a special technique, namely, a self-teaching process. What is meant is that the machine is made to play often, and it learns from its own errors.
Generally, this technique is stated in an over-simplified manner. It is thought that the programming has been so compiled that, when the machine loses a game, the error made is noted and the machine is directed to choose a different move at that point next time.
It is well to examine this over-simplification critically. Even in checkers, the number of times that the same position is reached is extremely small. Also, when a game, chess or checkers, is lost, the erroneous move may be quite unknown. It is possible to lose a game of checkers in, say, 25 moves of which 24 were good, and the bad one not necessarily the 25th. It could have been the 14th or 13th. Who determines that? It cannot be determined mechanically where the losing error occurred.
The reasoning: "Let the machine play, then it becomes stronger from the experience of its own errors" is entirely too superficial. The actual learning process is entirely different.

Dr. Samuel's evaluation function or equation contains a large number of terms, 31 to be exact. Mathematically expressed, it is: $\mathrm{E}=\mathrm{g}_{1} \mathrm{xK}_{1}+\mathrm{g}_{2} \mathrm{xK}_{2} \ldots$ $+\mathrm{g}_{31} \mathrm{xK}_{31}$.
In this equation, the K 's are the characteristics and the g's, the weights of these characteristics. Thus, $\mathrm{K}_{1}$ could represent the material present, $\mathrm{K}_{2}$ the number of center squares under control. The co-efficients $g_{1}$ and $g_{2}$ would represent the relative importance of the characteristics $\mathrm{K}_{1}$ and $\mathrm{K}_{2}$. Inasmuch as material is generally very important, $g_{1}$ will have a higher value than $\mathrm{g}_{2}$. The g 's have all kinds of values; there are even negative g's.

Samuel proceeded in testing and improving the evaluation function as follows. He took a number of master games from checker books and assumed, generally correctly, that the winner had made the best move each time. He let the machine play for the winner. The computer determined for itself the move to be made. with the evaluation equation, and Samuel compared this move with the book move. If machine and book agreed, then the machine went on. If they turned up different moves, then the machine also calculated the evaluation function for the book move, and Samuel compared the two evaluations. Not only the totals but also the component parts. He then adjusted
the co-efficients so that the machine would select a move closer to or identical with the book move. Then Samuel let the machine proceed with the improved evaluation function. Progress was slow but steady.

Then Samuel made a very important discovery. It completely changed the outlook for programming checkers. He programmed the machine in such a manner that it could itself adjust the evaluation function. He then let the machine run by itself, preferably during the night, playing through a great number of games so that, next morning, it could play a better game than the day before. The process had practical aspects as well as theoretical; for, after the computer had applied this learning process for some months, it was once able to beat a master at checkers in a convincing manner.

It was obvious that something similar should be tried for chess. But the euraтом study group soon found it impractical. It would have to work with an evaluation function, not of 31 terms as for checkers, but of 31,000 or $31,000,000$ or perhaps more.
So the study group faced the following problem: if it is impractical to develop programming with an evaluation function, then what is practical? Supplementation of numerical programming is definitely necessary. In most cases, examination with numerical programming gives no results. The so-called quiet positions (that is, ones in which no captures or attacks on the King are available) are still in the majority. And these, as explained in the previous article, are termed, quite properly for numerical programming, "dead."
For such positions, the machine, set for numerical programming, can give, say, ten moves which can be made without risk of material disadvantage. But it can indicate no preference for any one of the ten.
The chess player is acquainted with such situations from practical play. There is nothing special at hand. What to do? This is where strategy takes over.


Here is an example chosen from actual practice. White has the half-open Queen Bishop file, and there are a number of factors in the position which can beneficially influence the results of action


No. 1
E. Pogosanz

White mates in three


A Pawn on the eighth has many faces.

No. 2 Kenneth Howard White mates in two


Black the interference.

No. 3 Marian Wrobel White mates in two


In this whole haystack of pins, find the needle.

Solutions on page 214.
along that file. The action is undertaken first by the advance of the Queen Knight Pawn to N4 and to N 5 .

The intention is to disrupt the opponent's Pawn chain, to bring about weaknesses in the opponent's position and then tu attack the weaknesses.
These matlers are clearly described in pertinent text books. The starting point of these and similar theories on strategy are the teachings of Steinitz. World Champion Dr. Lasker continued the teachings and refined them. And they have been extended in later books.

Steinity' basic principle was: Make a plan which is in accord with the character of the position. The most important characteristic in the above position has been pointed out.

Now how can this be fitted into the programming of the machine?

In doing so, it is impossible to escape appraisal of the different factors on the board. Such appraisal is not outside the train of thought of the human chessplayer. Decision to attack along the half-open file includes, consciously or unconsciously, appraisal of the other factors: e.g. the presence of the Black material, the possibility of a direct advance of the Knight Pawn and the possibility of playing N-K5 at the right moment to increase the pressure which the advancing Pawn will exert on QB6.

The study team has set up an appraisal for all possible factors. The total number of points for a given position then is decisive for the question: shall White start action along that file or not?

This is, in fact, again an evaluation function-one solely applicable to this characteristic. Each characteristic leads to an evaluation function, and now comes the difference from evaluation functions previously described: the evaluation functions corresponding to the several characteristics are not added together. Instead, the largest is chosen as the preferred one. The strategy based on that characteristic which has the highest evaluation function is considered the one with the best chance of success and so has the preference in machine programming. This is the main point of strategic programming which the euratom commission added to the numerical programming for the machine.

An objection still exists: by application of this strategic method, a small difference may lead to large changes in the decision. The study team has tried to meel this objection by these distinctions for each characteristic: "less important," "could become important" and "decisive."
It was found, moreover, that, if the machine sometimes does not follow the best strategy, the results are less serious than those from faulty decisions based on an unreliable evaluation function.

One aspect in the programming has till now remained ummentioned-an as. pect offen discussed but usially exay. gerated because not properly clarified by the must competent of computer experts. A computer has a memory, and so the idea has necurred to preserve in the computer's memory the most important master games.
The memory of a modern computer can, indeed, store up a hundred housand master games, if necessary with commentaries. Then the computer can have a wealth of information which it may use to advantage in determining its move. If the computer found that, in a given position, Master X had continued some time ago with a certain move, that move could be the one selected by the computer.
The difficulty, however, as noted previmusly for checkers, is that, aside from the opening phases of the game, identical positions are extremely rare; they certainly are in chess. If we let the computer hunt for an identical position from the past, it will generally not find any.
In this hunt for similar positions, two serious problems arise. First, how to define precisely if the position is similar to the previous one or not? Second, it is quite possible that the two positions resemble each other, yet demand entirely different treatment. The latter point has been mentioned before in this arlicle. Small and seemingly unimportant differences can have substantial consequences regarding the choice of a move.
The idea of using the great memory of a computer need not be dropped entirely. It can be used to advantage for the openings and for endgames. Both uses were made by the elratom study group.
Assuming that the machine plays White, an openings repertoire was set up which required no special instructions for determination of the move. The machine simply follows the repertoire as long as the opponent does the same. Deviations on the part of the opponent require independent thought by the machine-that is to say it must then follow the numerical programming, supplemented by strategical programming especially designed for the opening.
For endgames, pertinent knowledge is of great importance for the human player as well as for the machine. How to treat an ending of King and Pawn against

## Solutions to PROBLEMART

(from preceding page)
No. 1 White mates after $1 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B7}$, and 1 $K-N 52$ P-NS(N) etc. or $1 \ldots P \cdot N 2$ P-KS(R) etc.
No. 2 White mates with 1 R-QN 6 and the threat of $2 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{NT}: 1 \ldots \mathrm{RXP} 2 \mathrm{RxR}$ or 1 . . KNPS 2 R-Q8.
No. 3 White mates with 1 N/K-133: e.g. 1 BXN $2 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Bl}$ or $1 \ldots \mathrm{BNP} 2 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q1}$ or $1 \ldots$ PxN $2 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 4$ or $1 \ldots \mathrm{RxP} 2 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 4$ or $1 \ldots$ QxP 2 Q-QT.

King? And how to win that with King and Rook against King? The study group has compiled programming for the most important, elementary endgames. It was added as a sort of sub-routine to the main programming and is to be used as stom as one of these elementary endings comes up in a game.
Review of the contents of these three articles indicates that a computer equip. ped with complete programming. supplemented with attack criteria and with strategic programming and extended with the prescribed moves of the opening and endgame, surely ought to be able to play a reasonable game of chess.
Such indeed is probably true-but, at present, only in theory. For the euratom computer has as yet not played an actual game. Although the several compiled programs were schematically completed, only part of the numerical programming has been converted to computer code. The latter is needed before the machine can be made to play a real game. For more than one reason, it would be highly desirable to test the basic solutions as to practical consequence. The work waits completion.
The job to be done, however, is not a little one of a few months time. Detailed programming requires a terrific amount of time, and is strewn with all sorts of disagreeable surprises.
For instance, the discovery that a detail has been overlooked requires a large amount of supplementary instructions. Then it may be found that a certain part of the programming requires too much time for practical use and so must be dis. carded. Computer work is in many respects a matter of trial and error, and the designer as well as the programmer acquire their knowledge in that manner.
Assuming that the complete project could be successfully completed, there would result a machine which could play chess with the ability of a good first class player. It would also be a machine which could play with the same ease a single game or a simultaneous performance of, say, a hundred boards.
Finally, one may think of a game between two computers even if equipped with the same programming. There would still be a gane inasmuch as the programming leaves at several points a substantial choice of moves.
And of still more interest would be a game between computers equipped with different programming. Which would win would turn on the one hand on the programming and on the other the capacity of the computers. It would be comparable to a game between human players in which, on the one hand, originality and ingenuity would play their parts and, on the other, physical condition and technique.
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# TOURNAMENT NOTES Progress Reports for Golden Knights Tournaments 

## 14th Annual Championship

In the 1960-1 Golden Knights, Finals section, $60-\mathrm{Nf} 32$, the last Finals for this tournament has started play with D E Ehmke, Dr M Ladacki, B Thompson and Dr C M Crenshaw as regular qualifiers and these three and a half point scorers with highest ratings at that time: V J Burdick 1508. D H Morris 1506 and F Peretti 1502.

## 15th Annual Championship

In the 1961-2 Golden Knights, A R Butler and RE MeCune have qualified for assignment to the Finals.

## 16th Annual Championship

In the 1963 Golden Knights, the following have qualified for assignment to the Finals: I M DiJoseph, D Howard, A Donins, P H Beckham, J Paterson, J P Laird, M Mitchell, J B Slavich, M Kleinick, S Greenberg and E A Pllumm.

Also, the following qualify for the Semi-finals: E S Elste, A Clementz and r A Pease.

## 17th Annual Championship

In the 1964 Golden Knights, Vine Smith of Brooklyn, New York, who was first to qualify for the Finals (see page 119, April issue), has become the fourth to qualify! As a multiple entrant, he will thus be in both 64 -Nf 1 and 64 -Nf 2 when we have qualifiers to fill them. So far, we have only two other qualifiers.

Meanwhile, the following have qualified for assignment to the Semi-finals: W R Simmons, J J Dragonetti, B R Trone, C Henderson, $R$ Donald, $G$ R Johnson, R T Weaver, W R Hardin, A Sildmets. J Baver, R E Pohle, M if Gottesman, F Magnone, R E Ellis, P Roth, W H Bragg, P Sherr, F B Bender, R D Grayson, H J Graves, G D Stark, K R Carson, M Valdes-Perdomo, J Mounier, M A Dowdell, S A Daniels and M F Lliso.

## 18th Annual Championship

In the 1965 Golden Knights, we have at last some qualifiers to the Semi-finals: G B Dunham, G Katz and C Barra are the first to secure places for what will be 64-Ns 1 when four more qualify.

By the end of May, the entry list dis. plays a total of an even 120 tournament sections or $\$ 46$ contenders.

## Notice to Golden Knighters

From all sections in play is months or more, we request reports from those with unfinished games. Give results in, listing opponents by name: sive untinished gumes. listing opponents, number of moves made and stating when you expect to finish and requesting extension of time in order to finish. If unsure of any report being ith, list all results with names of opponents.
From Preliminary Round sections, as asxigned with as close mailing ranse as possible we expect complete restits in within is months: most are in much sooner.
From Semi-finals sections with wider mailings ranses, we still need reports as soon as possible: so the rinals can yet under way. We expect all resslts in within iwo years.
We used to write and ask for any reports which appeared to be over-dtue. We no tonger have time to do so. Consequently, it is up to you to get reports in, check per Bute is to see they are properly published. mail is correction in if they are not and. finally, to tile a request for extension of time to finish any game which tuavoidathy is about to run over-time. But file such before time hats run out.

## POSTALMIGHTIES! Prize Tournaments

These l'ostalites have won prizes in the 1463 and 196 s Prize 'Tourntments.

| Tounney | Players | Place | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6\%-1) $\begin{gathered}1 \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{gathered}$ | H Best | .1st | $42-12$ |
|  | E A Schleicher | . 2nd | 1.2 |
|  | D Is McLeod | . 2nd | 42-13 |
|  | J R Spohr | . 2 and | 4.2 |
|  | 1 1 J Voker | . 2 nd | $3-3$ |
|  | M D Felsey | 2nd | $4-2$ |
|  | W G Chase | 2nd | 1-2 |
|  | I S MacFarland | 2nd | 42-13 |
|  | R A Carlyle | . 1 st | $6-9$ |
|  | E J Werner | .2nd | $1 \frac{1}{2}-1 \frac{1}{2}$ |
|  | J Lemke | 1st | $5 \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{4}$ |
|  | 1) Audrain | .2nd | 5-1 |
|  | G Simeonolf | Ist | 6-0 |
|  | J M Robinson | 2-3 | 42-13 |
|  | T J Roche | .2-3 | $4 \frac{1}{2}-12$ |
|  | J R Leach | 2nd | $5-1$ |
|  | M Goutesman | .1st | $6-10$ |
|  | S Morford | 1st | $6-0$ |
|  | It . P Pariseau | 2nd | $5-1$ |
|  | M Sakarias . | 1st | 6-0 |
|  | P Dylat | 1-2 | 5-1 |
|  | B P Hynes | . $1-2$ | $5-1$ |
|  | 1 L L Jepson | .1st | 5h-3 |
|  | F D Jostin | 2nd | 4.2 |
|  | R P Sorenson | .1st | $6-1)$ |
|  | F\& Gellish | 2-3 | 4-2 |
|  | K L Reynolds | 2-3 | + -2 |
|  | P \& Riegel | 1st | $5-1$ |
|  | II Lacey |  | 4 $2-12$ |
|  | 1 Erkmanis | st | 6-0 |

## Class Tournaments

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

| ourney | Players | Place | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $63-\mathrm{C} 134$ | J H Adams | 1-2 | -1 |
|  | A R Belisie | 1-2 | 5 -1 |
| 139 | B A Cassara | 1-2 | 42-12 |
|  | D DeRien | 1-2 | $4 \frac{1}{2}-1 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 14. | Mrs A F Clark | .1-2 | 4-2 |
|  | D C Smith | 1-2 | $4-2$ |
| 147 | L H Slocum | ,1-2 | $3-3$ |
|  | W Tymuiak | 1-2 | $3-3$ |
| 1.49 | A W Gordon | 1-2 | 42, 1 2 |
|  | F' Speck | .1-2 | $41-13$ |
|  | J Blumetti |  | $5-1$ |
|  | A R Sodaro |  | $5-1$ |
|  | R Greenberg |  | $6-10$ |
|  | T Bram | ..1st | 6 -0 |
| 127 | D W Brison | .1st | 42-12 |
|  | D J Kersula | 1-2 | $5-1$ |
|  | R A Scheper | 1-2 | 5-1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 136 \\ & 171 \end{aligned}$ | N Brant |  | $6-9$ |
|  | A H Dunlap | ,1-2 | 31-23 |
|  | AF P Sheldon |  | $3 \frac{1}{2}-2 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 182 | W P Jackson |  | $5-1$ |
| 197 | T Folkes |  | 6 -0 |
| 228 | W B Jones |  | $4 \frac{12}{2}-1 \frac{13}{2}$ |
| 252 | M Pariza |  | $6-10$ |
| 300 | Ft J Baker |  | 6 -1) |
| 305 | IV Datrymple |  | $42-12$ |
| 301 | d J Lavrena |  | (6-1) |

## NEW POSTALITES

The following new Postal Chess players hegan in May with these ratings:
CLASS A at 1300 : R L Collins, A Fisch, J Gillespie. R P Graham, J Holmes. J Mil1on, G Pader and T P Victory:
CLASS B at 1200: J Devid, J A Evans, N It Gassen. I Mejta, 1 Mevger. I Pressey, S B Skadden, W Smith and R A Ulreich; CLASS C at 900: H Appellhat, W C Bergsten. B Bobiner. D R Burleson, A Cantor, D M Coate. I M Conley, T Is Day, R Delaynay, R Dobbins, R W Elliott, D Foslien, H Funkhouser, M Furey, R Gervasi, D W Johnson. S A Tones. A Judson, R I Lipson, J L Mackay, w G Martin. W D McGehee, B S Morgan, G H Moriarty, R Nelson, A Parfit, R F Pauley, C B Proudfoot, A G Rosenshine. I Russen, W H Ryder, A G Schneider, E F. Senter, T Shortill, B Skinner. G Smith. J T Steffen, R B Stringer, R Tripp, D Vagle. R H K Water, D Warren, Whaten, w T whaten and $J$ wilson; CLASS D at 600: J Boitson, E. Boykin, K Burdsall, R C De Rosa, R R Fenske, Suzanme H Gaissert. J Hockman. W IS Karmopp. B Kendrick, S Laniado, E Loew, M P MacAdam, L Miller, S Miner, G Mummert, P Peskowitz, A W Ruska, 1, K Shaffer. J T steers, S Summerville, of Terry, if $R$ Thomas, L Walicki and I G Warren.

## RETURN POSTS

The following old timers returned during May at these former ratings:
A L Forster 1298; X P MacGrady 1100; and K V MeFarland 1300.

# POSTAL MORTEMS 

Game Reports Recoived

## during May 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. 65-c indicating Class Tourney begun in 1965) and by number (466) siven in text below the key.

Symbol indlcates a win by forfeit without rating credit; a shows a reting eredit adjudication; df marks a double-forfelt.

## CLASS TOURNAMENTS

Four-man Tourneys Graded by Classes

## Started 1963 (Key: 63-C)

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

Winners now set up by the closing of the May 1963 tourneys appear in Postalmighties! in this issue.
Tourneys 1-404: 13.1 Belisle bests Adams. 229 Patton and Weil tie. 400 Litwin licks Bom.

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

Tourneys 1-199: 7 Van Kulich mips Arneson. 9 Sidrys rips Isaacson. 22 Heverly tops (f) Landusky. 37 Diamond tops (2f) Carlson. 48 Greenberg tops (1f) Chupick. 64 Braun tops (1if) Whitt. 83 Nelson nips Sage. 90 Champney tops (2a) Leeper. 112 Berndt rips Restle. 115 Lockton licks Gieber, 122 Brison tops and ties Schliesing. 127 Kersula downs Dallas twice. 130 Miller jolts Johnson. 134 Brant tops (1f) Roseman. 137 DePaul, Lauer tie. 138 La Prade best.s Barrett. 148 Cassara conks Simpson. 150 Stonkus tops (10) Hodges. 155 Martin mauls Wallach. 157 Barnard, Peterson tie. 158 Reinbold downs Dulicai. 159 Chresoulis halts Hoag. 161 Bielefeld beats Kontra. 171 Sheldon downs Dunlap. 174 Price tops Schlisser. 182 Jackson jars Rosen. 190 Fee tops (21) Davis. 197 Folkes tops Smith. Eatman and (1a) Queen.
Tourneys 200-249: 203 Grau, Smith tie; Pitiman halts Hughes. 204 Smoor tops Centa twice. 206 Cohen, Monath tie 209 Clark tops (2f) Nesbitt. 211 Wong whips Brown. 214 Yan Lith bests Becker twice. 218 Gercke. Schleidt split two. 219 Schleidt tops Pace. 222 Boyd loses to Brown, withdraws. 22.4 Axup. Shepard tie. 225 Bearden downs Denniston. 228 Jones tops and ties Joslin; Joslin tops (1a) Nehring. 229 Beam, Larzelere tie, 232 Siteman bests Shingledecker but bows twice to Jackson. 233 Sharpe clips Clark, 234 Little tops Conitz, ties White: Kinslow tops Conitz twice. 237 Sauriol bests Zonies once, Bram twice; Zonies tops (2f) Mayer. 240 Hickman halts Songy. 242 Smith smites Peats 244 Burk tops (2f) Mayer: Kinslow conks Thach. 245 De Souza downs Croyle. 246 Rains. Russell tie.
Tourneys 250-289: 252 Pariza halts Hogan. 253 Klawitter beats Bowman. 254 Brimton tops Boyd. 255 Anders tops and ties Westbrook. 257 Shaffer bests Bancroft. 258 Bancroft conks Catalano. 264 Hallett halts Kiesling. 265 Bohen tops Brown twice. 267 Tuttle tops (Ia) Buell. 268 Bell bests Andrus; MeKibbin tops (2t) Waltner. 271

Roberts rips Seedorf: Seedorf, Roberts rout Arnold. 275 Kern tops Kyser twice. Farrer once. 276 Shader downs Miller, Bigier; Fetzer withdraws. 278 Gillespie, Gustalson whip Gosswiller. 280 Blumberg bows to Futthan but bests Snyder. 281 Baldwin rips Robinson twice. 282 Blumetti tops Gayton, 288 Stephansky stops Polllon, Maddax, 28.1 Merriam mauls Pattison. 287 Boynton bests Cooley, Fruss. 289 Altman tops Calvo twice.
Tourneys 290-329: 291 Tomaino socks Silkowski. 292 Gustafson beats Billman. 293 Kowe withdraws, 294 Baber bests Marcus twice, hows to Bocek and Lies Daniel: Bocek downs Daniel. 29.5 Thomas lops Constantine. 297 Struss socks Sulkes twice. 298 Hasbrouck loses to Aro but lieks Wells; Aro. Wells tie. 299 Noble splits with Lindberg. loses to Ouellette and tops (1a) Wagner; Lindbers. Onellette tie, 300 Upsher loses once to Carpenter, twice to Baker. 304 Canfield conks Silverman. 305 Dalrymple tops and ties Timmer and tops Robinson: Timmer splits with Robinson and tops Yeakel twice. 307 Lawrence licks Coss twice, 308 Fuscio routs Abraham; May spills Spit\%. 309 Russell. Millard rout Buarma; Russell rips Millard, 310 De Lozier licks Ciarlariello twice. 315 Bram, McCrossen whip Wagner. 316 Railey tops King twice. 317 Bourque bests Gerzadowicz. 319 Steffee beats Bridges; Dessaules withdraws.
Tourneys 330-389: 330 Horvath lies Angstenberger. tops Smith. 331 Stevenson stops sigler. 333 Cone tops B. Hill; L. Hill withdraws. 339 Spooner tops (2f) Finn. 340 Angsteuberger ties Zanath. bows to Vuylsteke: Vuylsteke tops Zanath twice. 341 Hickox bests Beal twice, 344 Maker mauls Atchley. Glass. $3 \cdot 16$ Himes tops McNutt, ties Stuber. 347 Carpenter conks Thomas twice. 351 W:ihon mauls Scheper. 352 Frithiof whips Cherry, Warren. 353 Walmisley licks Thomas, Lane. 3 Dat Peltis socks Sanders. 357 Barra tops (2f) Helfman. 358 Reis rips Scheper. 359 Hepner halts Pierce. 365 Trone trips Friedberg; Henderson withdraws. 366 Mckenna whips Weber twice. 367 Sachs halts Hogan. 368 Gerzadowicz tops Opp. 369 Mckenna licks Long. 379 Aparicio tops (2f) Jovely, 382 Boroughis bests Duperrault. Harper.
Tourneys 390-416: 390 Folkman, Trachtenberg tie. 391 Withers withdrawn. 395 Case tops Courtright wice. 396 Grossman bests Biles twice. 400 Fiesenbeck rips Goodin. 402 Cohen tops (1f) Gildea. 404 Blumetti fells Fay, 406 Slomowitz bows twice to Johnson but bests O'Neill twice. 407 Piracci tops Grossman. 409 Fontaine nips Neville twice, $\mathbf{1 0}$ Pruitt bests McGuire twice. 413 Rhodes tops (2f) Miller. 414 Langerman withdraws. 115 sladick withdraws.

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

Tourneys 1-59: 4 Arms bests Jessen but bows to Bancroft. 5 Lindberg licks Noble but loses to Lesniewski. 11 Maynard mauls Grossman. 16 Lebowitz bows to Dickerson but bests Van Horn. 19 Beam downs Siadak. 22 Dickerson defeats Grossman. 24 Grossman downs Dickerson. 26 Peach tops Thunen, 30 Bancroft, NeNulty tie. 32 Kirby conks Brand. 33 Reichard rips Indrieri. 35 Sobieraj tops (2f) Moore. 39 King conks Gossett, 40 Alexander tops (2f) Bird. 41 Harrison rips Regan. it Jacob withdraws. ${ }_{17}$ Shaffer spills Sprout, Chosak. 48 Shaffer halts Harrison. 49 Kinslow tops and ties Hogan. 52 Pruss stops Strasser; Brady bests Pruss once, Strasser twice. 53 Leedham licks Bower, MacKenzie; Robinson rips Bower. 55 Riegler bows to Nelson but beats Shearman twice. 56 Clark loses to Plant but licks brown twice.

Tourneys 60-191: 62 Davenport resigns to all. 6.4 Fetzer withdraws. 67 Jarvis, Farrison jar Pullen: Burtolini withdraws. 71 Gove tops (2f) Matonti, 72 Pratt halts

## Notice to all Postalites

Per Rule 18, you are responsible for checking through publication of your own results. After two years, games not reported may go double-forfeited (both players lose!).

Howard. 74 Grayson withdraws. 75 Gillen licks Ledlle twice. 86 Mastin tons (2f) LaFontaine. is Mangold replaces Kennedy: 104 Reichard and Smart replace Burtolint and Mass. 108 Stein tops (2f) Brown. It2 Corthell fells Faus. 143 Bendix withdraws.

## PRIZE TOURNAMENTS

## Seven-man Tourneys for Premiums

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

Notice: Gane reports on all tourneys bersun in July 1963 become past-due this month. Get in reports to reach us here before Aug. ust 1st, to avoid losing on double-forfeit (both players lose!).
Winners now set up by the closing of the May 1963 tourneys appear in Postalmighties! in this issue.
Tourneys 1-112: 15 Best wins from Roberts and O'Hearn. 40 McLeod Lops Stauffer. Detons, Korn and ties Moser. 56 MacFarland whips Winston. 62 Martin downs Kalash, DePesquo. 64 Barr bests Orbanowski. 82 Werner rips Rachlin: Carlyle licks Johnson. 83 Lemke tops Audrain and (f) Hunke and ties Soforic, 93 Simeonoff socks Peale. 101 Hauser tops (f) Hamilton, 103 Duykers downs Summerville. 104 Leach lops (f) Lutz, 106 Vergara spills Spear.

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

Tourneys 1-59: 1 Gottesman wins from Kontautus, 12 Morford mauls Mevorah. 17 Lach tops (i) Mayer, 18 Sakarias, Bergsma beat Kroodsma; Alberts, Bergsma tie. 20 Ensor tops Martin. 21 Parsons, Wiersch tie. 27 Klinkner, Trone tie: Bate bests Genz. 33 Jepson. Strupeck tie. 34 Joslin Jolts Hathway; Plucinski trips Hathway, Trone, 36 Sorenson, Clarkson clip Abrige. 37 Olson tons (f) Allen; Bullockus, Thomas tie. 39 Marica mauls Bratz, 43 Bartlett bests Chayt, Schliesing and von Saleski: von Saleski halts Humphrey. 44 Pitman, Seybold tie. 15 Riegel rips Lacey, 47 Birsten. Cook stop Stevens; Hoagland halts Cook. 48 Fontenrose halts Hawksworth: Scolt mauls Moks. 51 Larrabee clips Kline: Brison outpoints Pullen, 52 Mackin clips Clark. 33 Babb bests Halliwell, 5 L Lacey licks Lerum. $\overline{3}$ Gildea withdrawn. 57 Meister bows to Thomas, ties Du Dash.
Tourneys 60-89: 61 Buckendort beats Best: Cody conks Cuschleg. 62 Wojtowicz smites Smith. 63 Goldberg beats Burt. 65 Spooner bows to Becker but bests Rufer. 66 Reamer rips Buckendorf. 68 Malkin tops (f) Simon. 71 Marica mauls Gratef, Mott and bows to Greenberg; Sample socks Frank: Graeff withdraws. 72 North nips Spohr. 73 Stableford tops Taylor; Joseph Jars Jones. 74 Beer bests Hedrick but bows to Dickey and Bishop. 75 Ward whips Webber 76 Klein tops Aks, Winans and ties Boroviak; Bramante beats Stevens but bows to Winans. 78 Rapier downs MacDermid. 79 Klein clips Greenberg: Cain, Hynes rip Rugs. 80 Hardin licks Ashley, Sample but loses to Pehas: Schwartz axes Ashley. 81 Loeffler ties Wipper but loses to Erkmanis. 83 Halpert halts Evans, 84 Stayart, Lifson Jar Joslin; Lifson licks Schwab, 85 Stayart stops Chism. 86 Simms tops Tweten, 87 Carr conks Baker: Jackson withdraws, 89 Dickey, Walkling and Stephens conk Carlson,
Tourneys 90.109: 90 Bullwinkel beats Williams; Cotter, Mitchell tie. 91 Saam tops Thomas: Frank smites Smith. 92 Blanchard spilts Spohr. 93 Bronston rips Robinson. 94 Totte tops Carpenter; Sullinger bests Bowman. 95 Hujber ties Graeff, tops Ekstrom: Graeff withdraws. 96 Stark stops Charles. 37 Mangold, Reid, Kyker, Orbanowskf moly Tweten; Mangold tops (f) Joudrey. 98 Mareh tops Crum, Lies Matty; Winston ties Gallagher tops Crum, Matty: Nelson nips Crum. Sanborm. 99 Peterson outpoints Cole. Trotzuk: Ganzel, Robinson tie: Trotzuk trips Brown; Holliday withdrawn, loses (a) to Ganzel. 100 Carlyle tops Cotter and (i) Bettis: Neff rips Robinson. 101 Wheeler jars Jirovec: Rogers, Stayart tie. 102 Drasonetti drubs Prazak; Rockmore conks Karalaitis. 103 Eves, Kegan Jolt Jones, 104 Schaefer
whips Wilson：Lee licks Aparicio． 106 Trot zuk trips Yanis． 7 Twaiten tops Cook： Kativa conks Friedman． 10 s Beer tops（a） Shannon：Jarvis jars Kyker，Stumpf． Tourneys 110－120： 111 Booth，Barra best Linch． 112 Humphrey bows to Mintz but lests Rochel；Wurst withdraws． $115 \mathrm{Hog}-$ lund conks King．Soforic；Soforic sock Hitz：King licks Long． 116 Filipelli bows to Potter but beats Stohman；Ornelas with－ drawn．Ioses（a）to StohIman． 118 Sehmidt tops（a）Camon． 120 Van Gelder mauls Montgomery．

## Started in 1965 （Key：65－P）

Tourneys 1－50： 2 Strupeck tops（a）Can－ non． 4 Sadewater tops Russ，Inst and Wen－ nerstrom and ties Ward；Vard whips Rugs， 5 Barker，Jamison tie． 7 Loeffler loses to Carr but ties Dyba．\＆Ostrower tests Beats． 9 Strupeck withdraws． 10 Sladick withdraws． 16 Hall bests Belt， 19 Lane licks Lodato． 21 Buhalo beats Michaels． 23 Hahn halts Price． 25 Terry and Nechal replace Bolin and Lap－ sley． 29 Komor conks Bratz． 31 Mallett re－ places Kaye． 32 Freedman halts Hall． 42 Crow replaces Lagowski．

## GOLDEN KNIGHTS

Progressive Qualification Championships
11th Annual Championship－1957
PLAYOFFS（Key：57－Np）
Sections 1－2：1 Doe，Joyner tie．

## 13th Annual Championship－1959

## FINALS（Key：59－Nf）

Sections 1－32：Sections 22，24， 25 and 28 have over－due reports：report results now or apply for extension of play：if unsure if all your reports in，send summary of your results；reports from section 29 now due． follow same instructions； 31 Limarzi bests Boucher． 32 Calingaert rips Reed：Turbin beats Crenshaw．

## 14th Annual Championship－1960 FINALS（Key： 60 －Nf）

Sections 1－32： 21 Eaberg bests Benson． 27 Stauffer stops Baker． 28 Rudolph rips Snow． 30 Weininger whips Martin．

## 15th Annual Championship－1961 SEMI－FINALS（Key：61－Ns）

Sections 1－95： 10 Schotield fells Goodstein． 61 Stabler stops Belisle． 73 Cheswick，Ed－ bers tie． 75 Johnson， $0^{+}$Hearn tie． 78 Harves halts Biver． 85 Trenkamp tops（a）Leonard． 86 MeCume conks Buchanan． 89 Pease cracks Crites：Balmuth，Jarnagin tie． 9 Akrosd axes Maille． 92 Meshi mauls Freed． man． 93 Campbell conks Carroll：correction： Campbell tops（i）Jones． 94 Hildreth halts Frank． 95 Shepari licks Lydy：Milman withdrawn．

FINALS（Key：61－Nf）
Sections 1－31； 7 sonshine socks Gilssons． 9 Deen tops（in）Grossky． 10 Naff．Taner： tie． 11 Beckham bests Opp． 12 Fontenrose， Peretti tie． 13 Glass loses to Eilis，ties Bock： Slavich licks Ashley． 14 Stephan ties Dundas． Scheffer；Scheffer tops Dundas．ties Crossno． 16 Miller beats Muir，bows to Stoizenberg．is Dayton tops（a）Levine， 24 Kneeream nips Hardman， 21 DeVautt．Kifi tie． 22 Joyner jars Fearey． 23 Lester tops Yanis，ties Meiden：Meiden，Russanow tie． 24 Werner whips Pehas，Carr 26 Ferbes fells Cipes．

## 16th Annual Championship－1963

PRELIMINARY ROUND（Key： $63-$ N）
Sections 1－177：123 Harper tops（f）Ben－ son． 124 Tolins tops Kegan． 130 Crater．Elste tie． 159 Grabiel conks Kagan． 160 Clementz clips Cullum． 166 Reilly routs Lasky， $16 \mathrm{~N}^{\prime}$ Pease halts Hauser． 171 Wood whips Schaaf．

SEMI－FINALS（Key：63．Ns）
Sections 1．44： 7 Dyba，Thompson tie， 13 DiJoseph Jolts Johnson． 19 Lund licks Meyers． 20 Egle，Karalaitis tie． 23 Kiefling

Jitrs Jataska：Rich．Slevenson tie， 24 Graham dow is Deitrich． 25 Donins defeats Olson． Smith． 28 Slade tops（a）Hiber；Beckham bests Butler， 30 Harnach conks Carleton： Harris withdraws． 31 Chase nips Nester． 3 Woodworth beats Croshie，Hoglund but bows to Paterson：Ballard bests Hoglund． 35）Robinson ties Hózlund．Adashek and tops flamold：Zeroth halts Hoglund． 37 Griffin oses to Abramson but lieks Buzan， 38 Fucher，Pearlsiein tie 39 Howell．Stauffer ax Ew－her：Howell halis Hendry to bayes hows to worrell but bests Verdugs． 11 Latid tops Caride，ties Smith：Carlyle rins Russo， 42 Ozols．Pflumm jolt Joseph：Hildreth， Pflumm lie， 43 Buhrer bests Metaler but hows to Mitchell． 44 Vilson withdraws．
Sections 45－65； 45 Stark licks Marks but Ioses to Greenberg：Kleinlck clouts Slevens， Marks． 46 Walker whips Ross：Johnson Jars Ashey． 47 Ashley licks Bland． 48 Christian． son tops Schutte． 50 Rosenzweig rigs

## 管 曾 管 <br> Solutions to CHESS PUIZ

No． 1 White males after 1 RxB $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{t}}$ ！and（a） （b）i．KxR 2 Q，Nrt，K－R4 3 B－K2！etc，or QxPt etc．or 2 B－B2 3 BxBt．QxB 4 QxQt，R－N3 5 P－Nt广 etc．
No． 2 Black wins by $1 \ldots$ NxP！and（a） $2 \mathrm{PxN}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B3} 3 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B3}, \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{B} 4$ and 4．．．RxR； or（b） 2 RxR，N－R $6 \div$ ！ 3 PxS，QxKRP and 4 $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{BI}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 5 \dagger$ etc．or a B－B3，BNB etc．
No． 3 White wins by risN！and（a） 1
BXR 2 B－N7 etc．or（b） $1 \ldots$ BxB，QxI； etc．or（c） $1 \ldots$ PxF 2 BxB etc．or（d） 1

PXP 2 BxB，P－Ri is $Q$ mates：or（e） N－N5 2 BxB，KxB，Kxl＇t，RxR \＆ Q－RTł．K－B3 5 NxR ，and White wins Queen or mates：（f） $1 \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 1 \quad 2 \mathrm{R}-1: 1$ ，and mate follows：e．g．2．．．B－133 3 Rxls：R－K1 I B－BS！ 5 PxR，Q－R6！or $2 \ldots$ R－K1 3 13－B8！or 2 ．．．PxP 3 BxR ete．
No． 4 Black wins by $1 \ldots$ BxB and（a） 2 KxB，RxPi and 3 White takes，$犬$－ $\mathrm{K} 6 \dot{t}$ or $3 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R1}, \mathrm{BxP} / 6$ or $3 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1$ ，N－ K 6 will do bul Black can win bigger on last line：or（b） 2 N－B4，RxN and 3 PxR，QxS 4 KxL，Q－RT； ete，or 3 KxB，RxPit with sequels as in（a）． No， 5 White wins with $1 P-Q 6$ ！and（a） P－N4 2 PxQ etc．or（b） $1 \ldots Q-K N 2$ 2 B－KR4，R－Q2 3 B－K6 etc，or（c） 1 N×P 2 B－KR4，Q－QB2 3 BxR and 4 QxN ：or （d） $1 \ldots$ RxP 2 RxR，and $2 \ldots$ ．．．．NxR 3 $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B5}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3$ \＆ R －Q1 ete，or $2 \ldots \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R} 3$ QxQ．NxQ＋B－B̄̄，R－B3 $5 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ etc，or（e） 1．．．Q－Q2 2 B－KR4 or better 2 B－Q6！and \＃．Q－KN2 3．P－Q7 etc，or $2 \ldots$ QxB 3 R－N8个：KXR 4 P－Q7§，N－Q3（4．．．K－R1 5 Q－1it etc．） 5 RxN etc．
No． 6 Black salvages his win the one way possible： 1 ．．．Q－N5！and 2 PXQ．PxQ or ${ }_{2} R-N 3$ ，QxR ete．Note other retorts are futile，including $1+\ldots \mathrm{PxQ} 2 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 3$ ；as White mates．
No． 7 White wins with $1 \times \cdots 7 \dagger$ ：and（a） 1．．．BxN 2 QxP\％，K－R1 3 Q－K8t！RxQ + N－B7t，K－N1 5 NXRt．PxN 6 PxQ，K－B2 7 PxBs KxP \＆R／N－K14，K－Q2 9 RxR and 10 R－B6：（b）and（c）on Black King moves． White mates next．
No． 8 Black gains no win bs 1 ．．Q QN but does atter $1 \ldots B-B \cdot 1$ ：and（a）P－Q3． $\therefore x^{\prime \prime}$ etc．or（b） 2 P－Kit．BxP etc．or（c） 2 Q－B3．N－Q6t $3 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q1}$ ．Nxpt and $+\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kl}$ ． NXR 5 N／5－B4．Q－Rā̀ 6 P－N3．QxRP etc，or 1 K－131，N×R 5 N／s－B4．※－B7 ete．
No． 9 White wins with 1 Q－R7t：and（a） 1
$K-133$（as in the game）but 2 RxPt（as Hill suggests），KxR 3 Q－RT\％and $4 Q$－Rst etc．or（b） $1 \ldots \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K1} 2 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ and 3 RXPt etc，or（c） $1 \ldots \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 12$ RxPt ete．
No． 10 black wins by $1 \ldots$ BxN $\&$ RxS．
 K－N2，Q－R2 $6 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 2, \mathrm{NxP}$ and（a） 7 NxN ， QNN and mate follows 8 P．PSt or （1） 7 N－R4，PxN 8 KxN．PxPt with a mat－
 X －135：with a mating net after 8 PxS， SPxP．On 6 P－R4，Pxp forces a win，
$\ddagger=$ check：$t=$ dbl．check：$\xi=$ dis．ch．

## CHESS BY MAIL

If you have not played in our tournoya before，please specify in which clase you would like to start．We recommend Class A for unusually strong playerz， 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 capy of it，to CHESS REVIEW， 134 Weat 72d Street，New York，N．Y． 10023.

## CLASS TOURNAMENT

Start playing chese 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．

Your game results will be recorded and published in CHESS REVIEW 28 well aa your postal chess rating．

The entry fee is only $\$ 1.50$ ．You may enter as many sections as you please at $\$ 1.50$ each．Send coupon below．

CHESS REVIEW
134 W．72d St．，
New York，N．Y． 10023
1 enclose $\$, \ldots . . .$. Enter my name in （how many？）sections of your $\mid$ Postal Chess CLASS Tournaments．The amount enclosed covers the entry fee of $\$ 1.50$ per section．Kindly start／continue （strike out one）me in Class．

NAME
ADDRESS


## PRIZE TOURNAMENT

Start playing chess by mail NOW！ Enter one of the 7 man groups．
You will be assigned to a soction with six other players about equal to your－ self in playing skill．You play White against three of your opponents，Black against the other three－and you play all six games simultaneously．
You stand a good chance of winning a prize，too！Credits of $\$ 6.00$ and $\$ 3.00$ are awarsed to 1 st and 2 d place winners in each section．Credits may be used to purchase chess books or equipment．

The entry fee is only $\$ 2.75$ ．You may enter as many sections as you please at $\$ 2.75$ each．Send coupon below．

[^6]
## OVER THE BOARD

(Concluded from page 209)
Black patiently built toward an assault on White's weak Queen Pawn.

```
39 K-K3
40 P-N3
R-Q1
```

The plan was to double Rooks, forcing $R-Q 2$, and then to exercise the option of either . . . P.K5 or . . . R-R5 when the related opportunity should have pre. sented itself.

$41 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} \dagger$ ?
Here, in the writer's opinion, the game was theoretically lost for White; but, if White intended to pose any problems, he should not have disturbed the Pawns. The Pawn sheltered at R6 could have provided a base for entry with one of his Rooks at KN7 should the position have opened.

## 41 P-R7?

More troublesome would have been R-R2 behind the passed Pawn. Then Black would have been faced with the tedious task of winning the Rook Pawn. The text literally gave the Pawn away. Apparently, Dr, Rauch had aiready assessed his cause as hopeless and thus lost his fighting spirit.

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
42 \ldots & R-R 5 \\
43 \text { R-N2 } & R \times R P \\
44 \text { P-N4 } & R-N 3!
\end{array}
$$

This was the beginning of a mopping up operation which ended as follows.


Mate or the loss of a piece could not have been avoided.

Certainly, one of the author's most difficult wins against a so-called lesser light.

The very reason he had been so apprehensive over this game? In the first round, he had left a Pawn hanging in a favorable position and won narrowly and only because the opponent clearly forgot he himself had the advantage and consequently played too cautiously.


Thomas. i2 Heidel bests Landstrom but hows to Birsten. 33 Freeman downs O'Donnel!. 51 Mootin. Quiring tie. 56 Koblensky conks Hardin: Levine withdraws, 57 Smith Weinberg whip Chobot. 63 Rattler rips Lingk, Gt Gulliford withdrawn.

## FINALS (Key: 63-Nf)

Sections 1.10: 1 Sildmets tops (f) Hrowne. 2 Cook, Berg fell Favorite: Seney withdrawn. 3 Dreibergs drubs Kent. Bland; Kirchner socks Sokoles \& Grant withdraws 5 Gibbs, Perea best Bender; Jessen jolts Cotter.

## 17th Annual Championship-1964 <br> PRELIMINARY ROUND (Key: 64-N)

Sections 1-89: 2 Graham withdraws. 3 Hallam hatts Darsons. 15 Chapin, Frank tie. 22 Downs defeats McCormick. 23 Stormo stops Helper. 25 Simmons socks Mulliken. 30 Hoghund downs Duncombe. 32 Gottesman mutuls Muir. Kietling. 33 Dragonetti drubs Kramer. 38 Kent bests Belt, 46 Frank matls Perman. 51 Aicher tops (a) Lapenma, 5 a Trone trips Hyde, 58 Daly loses to Dransky but tops (f) Rayden. 60 Hannold conks Kimalatis. 62 Henderson beats Berger-Olsen: Woflowje\% downs Adorjan. 65 Ronan rips Dube: MeGelligan tops Schaaf. 71 Westhrook hests Lenton. 73 Connelly withdrawn. 71 dlonso lieks Larrabee. 78 Hall. Schataf ife. 79 Littrell licks Vittes, 80 Goodman. Larzelere tie. 82 Lefemina licks Lowden. 83 Van de Carr ties Jamison, loses to Byrd. St Vevuta tops Marshall. \$5 Bland downs Ireider. 87 Gordon whips Wolf. 88 PangLorn. Kersula conk Hamilion; Rosenbers rips Tomaino. 89 Johnson jolts Becker, Weisman.
Section 90-109: 92 Barton hows to Weaver hut bests DIJoseph. 95 Lane, Lerner tie. 96 tivingston toses to Soloc but licks Wil llatns. 97 Hardin halts Swain; Rabinowle bows to Hardia but bests Bendix. 98 Alherts fells Filip: Youngquist quells Cassill. 00 Burkett bows to Roberts but beats Klein. Steven clouts Klein: Sildmets sweeps Rolyerts. Stevens and Klein. 100 Deitrich trips Moore: Singer nips Nicoletti, 101 Baner bests Mantell, Brown, 102 Hamilon, Terry tie: Mooney conks Capilon. 103 Levine withdraws. 105 Pohle fells Feuquay, Crow: Crow downs Dale. 106 Westbrook whips Schleidt. 107 Bragh downs Van de Carr, 108 Bruce defeats De Leve, 109 Moyer licks Stern but loses to Crum: Magnone nips Nothnagle.
Sections 110-124: 110 Stuchell. Sidrys hat Hessel: Stolyenberg stops Sidrys. 111 Frank Jars Jepson. 112 Smart, Rundlett, Bischof and Wright mob Droeseh. 113 Levander loses to Goodall. Ellis and ties DeVore; Goodall bows to Ellis but bests Bithlockus. 115 Marshall halts Hendricks. 116 Webl whips Endsley. 117 Roth rips Lohrman; Schwab withdrawn, loses (a) to Lohrman, Tremblay. 118 Bragg tops M. Smith and ties Churchill. Pickard 119 Sherv Jars Johnson: Davidson ties Sherr and tops Kolts: Kolts conks Frank. 120 Bender downs Marshall. 121 Grayson routs Romero, Gibbs: Romero rips Walmisley. 122 Rosenberg. Spencer tie. 123 Werner, Diedrich down Heidel: Chernis beats Diekhaus but bows to Werner. 124 Howard flips Phillips; Doren licks Chohot but loses to Graves.
Sections 125-149: 125 Bell. Campbell wrimg Mahrt: Weihe conks Cuomo. 126 Stearns, Dalrymple and Layton down Dallas. 128 Kaplan, Stephan and Jessen moh Meyer. 129 Landey licks Terry. 131 Ashley whips Wolters. 132 Home stops Stephens: Stavk tops Shipley, (a) Traube. 133 Carson conks Teeler: Hornstein withdraws; Vades-Perdomo tops Peeler. (a) Hornstein, 131 Paterson cracks Crosbie: Stolzenherg stops Aparicio, 136 Eramante whips Webber. 137 Klein clips 13ier. 138 Whitman, Rash whip Waffle. 139 burt hows to Kelly but bests Friedbers: Mounier mauls Kelly, Hawksley. 111 Joyce folts Sherman. 141 Donins downs Greenwood. 112 Dowdell jars Zinck, Jacols. 113 DAtri ases Egan. 14t Daniels downs Roherts, Mendoza: Hilman conks Roherts, Carleton. 115 MacCarty, Koehler, Draughon drub Johnson. 14f Priebe mauls Fatman.

147 Brodersen bows to Hempel but bests Chace: Graham withdraws. its Thompson rips Rogers. $1: 19$ Crabtree beats Lown but bows to McGuinness; Roskind tops (f) Hanson: Herrick licks Crabtree, Lown and McGuinness.
Sections 150-151: 150 Crowder wins from Pompeii: Morrill jars Jickola; Seney withdrawn. 151 Schwarta licks Lane: Stearns wilhdraws.

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

Sections 1-31: 1 Kirchner, Voli liet Anderson downs Mezey, 2 Bohley bests Muir. 3 Buhalo bows to Dunham but beats Terry I Monson rops (a) Lamam. 6 Zwell whips Wright. 7 Smith downs Donins and ties Lenz. \& Pipher fells Sample. 9 Maillard mauls Goff; Goodman stops Stayart. 10 Healy bows to Kramer but bests Spitz: Woods tops (i) Kramer, 11 Soto withdraws. 11 MacConnell mauls Knobel: Pflumm nips Nusser. 15 Gurton tops Graves. 16 Cottingham conks Scott. 18 Katz conks Frank, 19 Lane licks Fenner, 22 Bloom, Tener tie. Q1 White withdraws.

## 18th Annual Championship-1965

## PRELIMINARY ROUND (Key: 65-N)

Sections 1-19: 1 Mekaig jars Jachimowica. 2 Erlberg, Carpenter nick Nickel. 3 Bender hests Scranton. 5 Fernando trips Trimingham: Hasbrouck Jars Johnson. 7 De Vianll downs Hyde. Sigler: Murphy mats Sigler. Thomas \& Johnson loses to Folkes and withdraws: Doren downs Smith. 10 Anderson defeats King. 11 Ward tops Donaldson. ties Blakeslee, 12 Hallett halts Green: Madison withdraws. 13 Goodale downs Leibbrand. 15 Phipps fells Harper; Parsons, Phipps lick Lund. 16 Stark smites Smith. is Jamison jars Menzel. 19 Booth beats Alberts but bows to Clark.
Sections 20-39: 20 Youngquist, BergerOlsen beat Menenberg; Berger-Olsen licks Levy. 22 Kaczmarek Jolts James, 24 Gault hests 13owling. 26 Dumham downs Richter. Partlow, 27 Osadea hests Bates, 28 Ferdinand bows to Peisach but bests Einstein, Muiler. 29 Sturtevant Joses to Fisch but licks Loeffler. 36 Lynch, Katz and Hamilton down MeDonald: Kat\% conks Hamilton. 31 Laird jolts Johnson. 32 Danon bests Buhalo: Quartucei withdrawn. 33 MacConnell fells Field, 34 Cohen withdrawn, 35 Shevrer licks Lewis, 36 Simeonoff stops didelston: Boss beats Quazzi: Graeff withdraws. 37 Gordon nips Neal, 3s Sohieraj bows to Witlin but bests Capper: Zonies whips Witlin. 39 Schwirtz conks Kelso: Barra bests Schmitt; Stewart withdrawn.
Sections 40-59: 12 Susswein wins from Smithers. 44 Frank topples (iehringer, Schultz: De Sherbinin tops (f) Schutz. 4,5 McKaig mauls Vaughan; Chaffee conks Keyes. 47 Dobrich downs Wilder; Sladick. MacGowan withdraw. is Gallagher licks Leibrand: Beal withdraws, 00 Stabler stops Telegat Stabler, Parkinson stab Gehringer: White withdraws. 51 Chase bests Friedeniberg but bows to Muiliken. 52 Weithoff ties Warren and loses to Gilbert. 53 Sibbett socks Carpenter: Osborne bests Vaughan: Wilson withdraws. if Smith smites Moyer. Yevata. 35 Chinn loses to Bancroft but licks Barasch. 56 Pepper beats Sigl but bows to Moyer. 57 Vorglahn whips Wennerstrom. 58 Morvill mauls Tschopp.
Sections 60-99; 61 Fogg downs Dickey. 63 Ashley tons Shattuck: Carpenter conks Pyle. 64 Grabiel. Amburn rip Rush, 66 Ferret fells Bloom: Stayart stops Hendrtcks. 70 Ketterer belts Belt. 71 Fubbart rips Rausch. 72 Prince tops Manteil, 74 Groner socks Simmons. 76 Elowitch ties Congleton and tops Page: Walters withdrawn, loses (a) to Page. 75 Kalinat tops Cross, ties Kolts. 79 Rosenberg, Goodman rout Simms. so Woosles halts Hassempflug. \&1 Pariza manls Munns $\$ 2$ Schwartz fells Finlay. \&4 Cook conks $F$. Brown, 85 Ashley, Orem tie: Boyd withdraws. sf Martin. Smith top Sachs. 89 Chiesa loses to Dragonetti, Pavitt and withdraws. 91 Ingalls. Orem ax Lym. 92 Aprt conks Carrigan.
Sections 100-120: 10S Cayford wius from Detrich.

## POSTAL GAMES <br> frort CHFSS REVIEW tourneys

## Annotated by JOHN W. COLLINS

## An Ideal Matching

Featuring somewhat unique opening strategy and hard-fought piece play throughout, this game involved two players with identical ratings (1104). And the outcome decided which one entered the Finals.

## SICILIAN DEFENSE

R. Fowkes
R. Heinoo White

| 1 | P-K4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 | N-KB3 |
| 3 | P-QN4. |

P-QB4
3 P-QN4.
P-Q3
This is Keres delayed version of the Wing Gambit. With proper play, Black has no reason to fear it.
$3 \ldots \quad \mathrm{PxP} \quad 5 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q3} \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q4}$
On 6 . . . P-K3 7 O-O, N-B3 $8 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$. B-K2 9 P-K5, N-Q2 $10 \quad \mathrm{~N}$-B1, O-O 11 N-N3, N-N3, Black stands better:

$$
7 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{P}
$$

$\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}$
The recommended line is $7 \ldots$. . QN-Q2 $8 \mathrm{~N} / 4-\mathrm{N} 5, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 29 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 310 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 3$, P-KN4!

## 8 BxN

P-B4
Black's thrust is interesting but dou-ble-edged. 8 . . . N-Q2 $9 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ $10 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ is safer.

$$
\begin{array}{rlll}
9 & \text { B-Q3 } & \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3 & 11 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} \\
10 & \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3 & 12 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5! \\
& \cdots .
\end{array}
$$

Else. Black consolidates with $12 \ldots$ $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ and $13 \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$.

| 12. . | Q×P |
| :--- | ---: |
| 13 B×NP | R-KN1 |
| 14 B-KR6 | $\cdots$ |

$14 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ is more precise.

| $14 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | 16 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | 17 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\ldots .$. |

Here $18 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ is one threat.

| $17 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 4$ | 19 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 5$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $18 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 5 \dagger$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ | 20 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |



21 N-Q4
The text involves simplifying to an ending with Black a Pawn up. But the alternative to exchanging is a very strong King-side attack by Black with $\ldots$ P-K5 . . . Q-K4 and . . . B-QB3.

| $21 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $23 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Q}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $22 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $24 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5$ | $\ldots$. |

$24 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5$ t is better: $24 \ldots \mathrm{~F}-\mathrm{B} 225$ B-B6.

| $24 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | 26 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 5$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $25 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$ | 27 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |

27 . . BxR is met by $28 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 6 \dagger$.
28 R-N1
P-R4
29 NxRP
. . . .

White has regained his Pawn, but his Queen-side Pawns are weak and his pieces unco-ordinated.

| $29 \ldots$ K-B2 |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| 30 B-N6 | P-B5 |
| 31 N-N5 | P-K6! |

Here 31 . . . R-KN1 is met by 32 BxKP. With the text, Black acquires a passed Pawn-so often worth a piece! $32 \mathrm{PxP} \quad \mathrm{PxP} \quad 34 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 6 \dagger \quad \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 3$ 33 B-Q3 B-QB3 35 P-QR3


35
35 . . . R-KN1 is stronger. 36 R-K1
$\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{N}$
Again, $36 \ldots \mathrm{~N}$ - Q 7 is stronger: 37 BxN, PxB 38 RxB, R-Q3.

| $37 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | $40 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 7$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 38 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ | $41 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3$ |
| $39 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B} \dagger$ | $42 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5!$ |

This new passed Pawn soon becomes, the decisive factor.

| 43 | P-N5 | B-Q4 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 44 | R-R1 | $R-N 5$ |
| 45 | R-Q3 | $K-B 4!$ |

A better King position helps a lot.
46 R-K3
K-N5
48 B-N2
P-N3 47 R/3-R3 B-N6 49 B-Q5 R-B8 $\dagger$ !

Black demonstrates a clever way of removing the blockaders. 49 . . . BxB loses to $50 \mathrm{RxP} \uparrow$, KxP 51 RxR.
$50 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$
$\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{R}$
53 R-K8
P-R6
51 B-B3 K-N7 54 R-QR8 R-QR5
52 R-K1 R-QB5 Resigns

## One Does, One Does Not

White secures an irresistible attack on Black's King-side-castled position as Black fails to mount a counter attack on the other wing.

## KING'S INDIAN DEFENSE

D. Scheffer

Dr. I. Schwartz
1 P-Q4 N-KB3 3 N-QB3 B-N2
2 P-QB4 P-KN3 4 P-K4 P-Q3
$5 .$. P-K4, 5 . . . P-B3 and 5., . QN-Q2 are alternatives.
$\begin{array}{llrr}6 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4 & 8 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2 & \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} \\ 7 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3 & 9 \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P} & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3\end{array}$

Probably, the sooner the King-side Pawn roller gets moving the better. Therefore. $10 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KN}+!$


11 B-R6
P-KR4.
$11 \ldots$
P-QN4
12 P-KN4

Confronted with the advance of the Queen.side Black Pawns, White ought to play $12 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1$ and $13 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$.

$$
12 \ldots \quad Q-B 2
$$

12 . . . P-N5 is better. The Queen is not well posted at B2.

| 13 | K-N1 | P-N5 | 15 | P-KR4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 14 | QN-K2 | P-R4 | 16 N-N3 | B-Q2 |

"A wild and perhaps unsound line is 16 . . . BxP 13 PxB, KNxKP 14 NxN , NxN 15 Q-B1, N-B6t 16 PxN, PxP 17 $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ ? $\mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{N} 1 \dagger 18 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 7 \dagger 19 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 3$, Q-B4! But Dr, Schwartz was not in a vicious mood, Fischer or Tahl might find the key."-Scheffer.

$$
17 \text { P-R5 }
$$

B-R5

17 . . . $\mathrm{P}^{2}-\mathrm{R} 5$ and further advance of the Rook and Knight Pawns to open a file is in order.

| $18 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | $K R-N 1$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| $19 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}$ |

19 . . . RPxP is fatal: $20 \mathrm{BxB}, \mathrm{KxB}$ 21 Q-R6t, K-NI 22 Q-R8 mate.

| 20 | B-K3 | B-B1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 21 | N-R3 | R-B1 |
| 22 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5$ | Q-K2 |

$22 \ldots$ Q-Q2 is more exact.


23 BXN !
Here white sparks what is really a six-move, winning combination.

| $23 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ | 26 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4+$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| $24 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $27 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 2$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 2$ |  |
| $25 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 6!$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $28 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | Resigns |  |

On 28. . NxN, White actually mates after $29 \quad$ QxN ${ }^{+}$and likewise weaves a mating net on $28 \ldots$ N-N1 29 N-B5 $\dagger$ and on 28 . . . N-R4 $29 \mathrm{PxN}, \mathrm{KxN} 30$ PxP* and $31 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 5$.
"The game was over when white was able to activate his King Bishop by sacrificing his Queen Pawn. A most enjoyable attack (from White's point of view)."-Scheffer.

## PERSONAL SERVICE

The Editor of this department, a former Marshall Chess Club New York State and U. S. Correspondence Champion, and Co-reviser of Modern Chess Openings, 9th ed.. will play you a correspondence game and give critical comments on every move for a $\$ 15.00$ fee. Write to John W. Collins, 521 East 14 Street. New York, N. Y. 10009 ,

# WORLD CHAMPIONSHIP CHALLENGERS ROUND - 1965 

## QUARTER FINALS - Bracket A

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Tołals | W D L |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Boris Spassky | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 6 | -4 | 4 | 2 |
| Paul Keres | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 4 | -6 | 2 | 4 |

## Spassky vs. Keres, Riga, Laivia

Game 1 QUEEN'S INDIAN DEFENSE White: Spassky

Black: Keres 1 P-Q4, N-KB3 2 P-QB4, P-K3 3 N-KB3, P-QN3 $4 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 25 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 36$ $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R} 4, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 27 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 58 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$ $9 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{N}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N} 10 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 5 \dagger 11 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$, $B \times P 12 R-K N 1, B-N 213 R \times P, N-B 314$ $P-B 5, P \times P 15 P-Q R 3, Q-R 416 P-N 4$, PxNP $17 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 518 \mathrm{PxP}, \mathrm{QxP}+19$ K-B1, Q-B1 20 R-N3, N-K2 21 N-B5, B-B3 22 P-K4, R-KN1 23 R/1-R3, R×R $24 R \times R, R-N 125 P-Q 5, P \times P 26$ Q-R1, PxP 27 B-R5, R-N4 28 Q-Q4, N-N3 29 $B \times N, P \times B 30 N \times K P, R-N 8 \dagger 31 K-K 2$, R-N5 $32 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 6 \dagger, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 133 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 4$ White resigns.

Game 2
RUY LOPEZ
Black: Spassky White: Keres 1 P-K4, P-K4 2 N-KB3, N-QB3 3 B-N5, P-QR3 4 B-R4, N-B3 5 O-O, B-K2 6 R-K1, P-QN4 7 B-N3, P-Q3 8 P-B3, O-O 9 P-KR3, P-R3 10 P-Q4, R-K1 11 QN-Q2, B-B1 12 P-R3, $B-Q 213$ B-R2, P-QR4 14 Q-N3, Q-K2 15 N-B1, P-R5 16 Q-B2, P-N3 $17 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 218 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 5, \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{N}$ $19 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N}, \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{B} 120 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 421 \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$, K-R2 22 R-K2, KR-Q1 23 R/2-Q2, B-K1 24 B-R2, P-KB3 25 R-Q3, P-KB4 26 $N-R 2, B P \times P 27 R / 3-Q 2, P \times P 28 B \times Q P$, $B-B 229 K B \times B, Q \times B \quad 30 B \times B, K \times B 31$ Q×KP, N-B5 32 R-K2, R-K1 33 Q-Q4 $\dagger$, Q-B3 $34 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q} \dagger, \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{Q} 35 \mathrm{R} / 1-\mathrm{K} 1, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ $36 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} 37 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 138 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$, K-K3 $39 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 440 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 4, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{E} 441$ $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB1}$ (sealed move) $42 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 1$, P-Q4 $43 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1+44 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 1$, K-Q3 $45 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 446 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KN} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 447$ R-K2, RxR $48 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 449 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 1$, K-K3 50 $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} 51 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 552 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 3$, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 453 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 1, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 554 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 6 \dagger$ $55 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 456 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{PxPi} 57 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, N-N3 58 K-Q3, P-R4 59 N-K4, N-B5 60 $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 3 \dagger$, $\mathrm{KxP} 61 \mathrm{NxP} \dagger$, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 462 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3$, NxP Drawn.

Game 3 NIMZO.INDIAN DEFENSE White: Spassky

Black: Keres 1 P-Q4, N-KB3 2 P-QB4, P-K3 3 N-QB3, B-N5 4 B-N5, P-KR3 5 B-R4, P-B4 6 P-Q5, P-Q3 $7 \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 48 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 2$, QN-Q2 9 P-QR3, B-R4 10 Q-B2, O-O 11 $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 112 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 2, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 213 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$, P-K5 14 P-B4, P-KN4 15 B-N3, N-R4 $16 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 217 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 418 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$, $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 319 \mathrm{P} 4 \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} 20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 1, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 221$ P-QN4, B-N3 $22 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 4, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 223 \mathrm{~N} / 2-\mathrm{B} 3$, B-Q1 $24 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P} 25 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{N} 26$ P-Q6, Q-K3 27 R-Q1, B-Q2 28 B-N3, P-B4 29 N-N5, R-KB1 $30 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3$
$31 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 7, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 132 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 5, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 333 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 2$, B-R5 34 R-B1, R-KB2 35 B-K5, Q-N3 $36 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 4, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{QB} 337 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P} 38 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 4$, $B-Q 239 \mathrm{QxP}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 340 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 1, \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{QP} 41$ $B \times B, Q \times B 42 B \times N, Q \times B 43 Q \times P, R-N 1$ 44 RxR, K $\times$ R $45 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 7 \uparrow$, K-K1 $46 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB}$ i. Q-K3 47 P-KR3, R-B1 48 Q-KN7, B-K2 49 R-B5, B-Q3 50 R-B6 Black resigns.

For comments by Euwe, see page 16 S , June issue.

Game 4
RUY LOPEZ
White: Keres
Black: Spassky
1 P-K4, P-K4 2 N-KB3, N-QB3 3 B-N5, P-QR3 $4 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 4, \mathrm{~N}$-B3 $5 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 26$ R-K1. P-QN4 7 B-N3, P-Q3 8 P-B3, O-O 9 P-KR3, P-R3 10 P-Q4, R-K1 11 QN-Q2, $\quad \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 112 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 213 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, QNxP $14 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{N} 15 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 416$ $R-Q 1, P-B 517 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 218 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 3$. PxP 19 PxP, KR-B1 $20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 42^{1}$ $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 522 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} 23 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 6$ $24 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 525 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B} 26 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{N} 1$, Q-K3 27 Q-Q1, N×P $28 \mathrm{BXP}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B} 29$ QxR, $N-B 630 Q-B 2, N \times R 31 R \times N, R-R 1$ 32 Q-R2, B-B4 33 R-N5, R-N1 $34 R \times R+$, $Q \times R 35 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 5, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{KN} 636 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 6 \dagger$ $37 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 538 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 3, \mathrm{QxP}+39 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 1$, $P-R 7$ White resigns.

Game 5
RUY LOPEZ
White: Spassky
Black: Keres 1 P-K4, P-K4 $2 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 33 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5$, P-QR3 4 B-R4, N-B3 5 O-O, B-K2 6 R-K1, P-QN4 7 B-N3, P-Q3 8 P-B3, O-O 9 P-KR3, N-QR4 $10 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 411 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$, Q-B2 12 QN-Q2, B-Q2 $13 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}$ $14 P \times P, Q R-B 115 \quad N-K 3, K R-K 116$ $P-Q N 3, P \times P 17 \mathrm{~N} \times P, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 118 \mathrm{~B} 18$ N2, Q-Q1 $19 \mathrm{~N} / 4-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N} 20 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3$ $21 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 222 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 223 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 4$, Q-K2 24 P-B3, Q-B1 25 B-N3, N-Q1 26 QR-Q1, R-B3 27 R-QB1, Q-K2 28 K-R2, Q-Q2 $29 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 5, \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{N} 30 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} 31$ $R \times R, Q-K 232 B \times B, K \times B 33 Q-B 3 \dagger, K-N 1$

Keres-Spassky. Game 8


Position atter $25 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$
$34 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B4}, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 335 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 236 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 7$, Q-B3 37 R-B2, R-KB1 38 Q-N6, $P-N 4$ $39 P \times P, Q \times P 40$ QXRP, Q-K4 41 QxNP, N-K3 42 Q-B1, K-N2 43 Q-B5 Black sealed, then resigned without resuming play.

Game 6
White: Keres
ENGLISH OPENING Black: Spassky -K4 $2 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 33 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 54 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3 \mathrm{~F} 5 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3$, BxN 6 $\mathrm{QxB}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 37 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 28 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ 9 B-Q3, $N-R 310$ O-O, $P \times P 11 P \times P$, N-B4 12 B-B2, N-K1 13 Q-K2, P-B4 14 P-B4, P-K5 15 P-KN4, P-KN3 16 K-R2, B-B3 17 B-Q2, R-B1 18 R-KN1, K-R1 19 QR-N1, P-QR3 20 R-N2, P-QN4 21 P-R3, N-B2 22 R/1-N1, Q-Q2 23 PxP, $P \times P 24$ Q-R5, R-KN1 25 P-N4, N-Q6 $26 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 3, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} \dagger 27 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 128 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 2$, N-N2 29 Q-R6, Q-KB2 Drawn.

Game 7 QUEEN'S INDIAN DEFENSE White: Spassky

Black: Keres 1 P-Q4, N-KB3 2 P-QB4, P-K3 3 N-KB3, P-QN3 4 B-N5, P-KR3 5 B-R4, B-N2 $6 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 47 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 28 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} \quad 9 \quad \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{O}, \mathrm{O} \quad 10 \quad \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 311$ $R-Q B 1, N \times N 12 Q \times N, N-K 513 B \times B, N \times N$ $14 R \times N, Q \times B 15 R-Q 1, K R-Q 116 Q-Q 6$, QxQ 17 RxQ, K-B1 18 R-Q2, K-K2 19 P-B4, KR-QB1 $20 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 221$ R-R3, P-Q3 22 P-KN3, B-K5 23 R-B3, R/1-QB1 $24 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 225 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 326 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3$, P-KN4 27 R-B1, B-N2 28 R/1-Q1, P-Q4 2) $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{QP}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P} 30 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 1, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 531 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 332 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 433 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 3$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R} 534$ $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB1} 1, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} \dagger 35 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 1 \mathrm{3} 3 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 4$, P-KR4 37 B-K2, P-B3 38 P-KN4, PxP $39 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 7 \uparrow$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 240 \mathrm{BxP}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ Drawn.

Game 8 NIMZO-INDIAN DEFENSE White: Keres Black: Spassky 1 P-Q4, N-KB3 2 P-QB4, P-K3 3 N-QB3, B-N5 4 P-K3, P-QN3 5 B-Q3, B-N2 6 $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 57 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N} 8 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{QBP}$ $9 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N} 10 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 4 \dagger 11 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$, Q-R $412 R-K N 1, Q \times B P+13 R-N 2, P-K B 4$ 14 B-R3, N-K5 15 R-KB1, R-N1 16 B-K2, Q-R6 17 P-B3, N-KB3 18 P-Q5, K-B2 19 P-K4, P-B4 20 B-N2, P-B5 21 P-K5, N-R4 $22 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 323 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 4$, R-Q1 24 B-Q3, R-N1 25 R-B2 (See diagram) Black resigns.

Game 9
RUY LOPEZ
White: Spassky
Black: Keres 1 P-K4, P-K4 2 N-KB3, N-QB3 3 B-N5, P-QR3 4 B-R4, N-B3 5 O-O, NXP 6 P-Q4, P-QN4 7 B-N3, P-Q4 $8 \mathrm{NxP}, \mathrm{NxN}$ $9 \mathrm{PxN}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 310 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{QB} 411$ $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{N} 12 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N}, \mathrm{O}, \mathrm{O} 13 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3$ $14 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 6, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 315 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P} 16 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$, $B \times B \quad 17 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 218 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} \dagger, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R} 19$ $Q-R 4, B-K 320 R-K B 1, Q-Q 321$ B-B2, R-R2 22 P-QN4, B-B2 23 Q-Q4, R-QB2 $24 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 425 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 6, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 226 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3$, Q-K1 $27 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P} 28 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 229$ $P \times P, Q-K 8 \dagger 30$ R-B1, $Q \times P 31 \quad Q-Q 8+$, $K-N 232 P-Q 6, Q-K 6 \dagger 33 \quad K-R 1, Q-B 5$

34 R-KN1, R-B6 35 Q-K7, R-K6 36 Q-QB7, $R-Q 637 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q} \div \mathrm{B} 38 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 1$, P-N4 39 P-KR3, K-N3 40 Q-B6, Q-Q4 Drawn.

Game 10 KING'S INDIAN DEFENSE White: Keres Black: Spassky 1 P-Q4, N-KB3 2 P-QB4, P-KN3 3 N-QB3, B-N2 4 P-K4, P-Q3 5 P-B4, P-QB4 6 P-Q5, O-O $7 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 38$ $B-K 2, P \times P 9 B P \times P, P-Q N 410$ P-K5,

PxP 11 PxP, N-N5 12 B-KB4, N-Q2 $13 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 6, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} 14 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B} 15 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 5$, $K-R 116$ QxR, $N-Q N 317 Q \times P, B \times P 18$ O-O, N-K6 19 R-B2, P-QN5 20 N-QN5, R-B2 21 Q-R5, Q-QN1 22 R-K1, B-Q4 $23 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{B} 24 \mathrm{R} / 2 \times \mathrm{N}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 525 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 6$, R-B3 26 Q-R4, $N \times P 27 \quad Q-B 2, Q \times N 28$ R-K7. N-Q6 29 Q-K2, P-B5 30 R-K8 1 , R-B1 31 R $\times R \dagger$, $\mathbf{B} \times \mathrm{R} 32 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KN} 5$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 4 \dagger$ $33 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 234 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 235 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$, Q-K6 White forfeited on time.

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Totals | W D L |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Yefim Geller | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1 | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | $51 / 2-21 / 2$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | 5 |
| 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Geller vs. Smyslov, Moscow, Russia
Game 1 NIMZO.INDIAN DEFENSE White: Geller Black: Smyslov 1 P-Q4, N-KB3 2 P-QB4, P-K3 3 N-QB3, B-N5 4 P-K3, P-QB4 5 B-Q3, P-Q4 6 $N-K B 3, Q P \times P 7 B \times B P, P-Q R 38 P-Q R 3$, $B-R 49 \quad O-O, P-Q N 410 \quad B-K 2, P \times P \quad 11$ $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{QP}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 212 \mathrm{~B} 2 \mathrm{~B}, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B} \quad 13 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$, R-R2 14 P-QN4, B-N3 $15 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 6, \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{N} 16$ $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{N} \dagger, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 217 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} 18 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$, $Q-B 119 Q \times Q, R \times Q 20 R-Q 6, B-Q 121$ $R / 1-\mathrm{Q} 1, \quad \mathrm{R} / 1-\mathrm{B} 222 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 4$, B-K2 23 R/6-Q2, P-KB3 24 P-B4, K-B1 25 B-Q4, R/R-N2 $26 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$, R-B5 $27 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{R} / 2-\mathrm{B} 2$ $28 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 4, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 729 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 4, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} 30 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$, K-B2 $31 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 5, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 432 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 333$ $N P \times P, N P \times P 34 R-N 2, P \times P \quad 35 P \times P$, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 236 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 4, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 5 \quad 37 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 3$ 38 R-Q3, R-B3 $39 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 140 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5$, R-B5 41 B-B5, R-B8 (sealed move) 42 P-B5 $\dagger, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 243 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 6 \dagger, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 144 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 3$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N} 45 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 846 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 247$ $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 8 \dagger, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 248 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 7 \dagger, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 149 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 8 \dagger$, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 250 \quad \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 7 \dagger, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 151 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 6, \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{B}$ $52 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{N}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 8 \dagger 53 \mathrm{~K} \dagger \mathrm{~K} 2$, R-QB8 54 R-QB7, P-R4 $55 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 556 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 3$, R-B8 $57 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q4}$, R-Q8† $58 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 4$ Black resigns.

Game 2
ENGLISH OPENING White: Smyslov Black: Geller 1 N-KB3, N-KB3 2 P-QB4, P-QB4 3 $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 34 \mathrm{P} 4 \mathrm{KN} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KN} 35 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$, B-N2 $6 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} 7 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4, \mathrm{PxP} 8 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{P}$, $N \times N 9$ QxN, P-Q3 10 Q-Q3, P-QR3 11 $B-Q 2, R-N 112$ QR-B1, B-B4 13 P-K4, B-Q2 14 P-KR3, P-QN4 $15 \mathrm{PxP}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ $16 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 4, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 117 \mathrm{NxP}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P} 18 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$, R-R1 19 P-N5, R-R6 20 R-R1, Q-R4 $21 R \times R, Q \times R 22$ P-N6, R-N1 23 Q-K3, Q-R3 24 R-N1, B-K3 25 B-KB1, Q-N2 26 R-N5, B-Q2 27 R-N3, B-B3 28 B-N2, N-Q2 29 N-Q5, N-B4 30 R-N4, N-R3 31 $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 1, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 332 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 433 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 4$, Q-R3 34 B-KB1, Q-R6 35 R-N1, Q-R1 $36 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 337 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{KB} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 138 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$, Q-R3 39 B-KB1, Q-R1 40 B-N2, Q-N2 (sealed move) 41 R-N4, Q-R3 42 B-KB1, Q-R6 43 R-N1, P-R4 44 P-B3, B-K4 45 $K-N 2, N-Q 246 B-K 2, Q-B 447 Q \times Q, P \times Q$ $48 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 7, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P} 49 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R} 50 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{QN} 5$, $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 151 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 4, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 552 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 6, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ $53 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{B} 54 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 455 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2$, P-KB4 56 PxP, KPxP 57 P-B4, N-B3 58 $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 259 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 7, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 560 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$, $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{B} \dagger 61 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 362 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 6, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6$ $63 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 3, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 564 \mathrm{KxP}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 7 \dagger 65 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 3$,

NxNP 66 P-R4, K-K3 67 N-B4, N-K5 $68 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 4, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 769 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 5, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 370 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 7 \dagger$, K-N2 $71 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 5, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 572 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 373$ $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 5, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 774 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 7 \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 375 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5 \dagger$, K-K2 76 K-Q5, N-B8 77 K-Q4, K-Q3 78 N-B7†, K-K3 $79 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5 \dagger$, K-K2 Drawn.

Game 3
NIMZO.INDIAN DEFENSE White: Geller

Black: Smyslov 1 P-Q4, N-KB3 2 P-QB4, P-K3 3 N-QB3, B-N5 4 P-K3, P-B4 $5 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} 6 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$, $P-Q N 37 P-Q 5, P \times P 8 P \times P, N \times P 9 B \times P \frac{1}{1}$, $\begin{array}{lll}K \times B & 10 & Q \times N, \\ B \times N\end{array} 11 P \times B, Q-B 312$ O-O, N-B3 13 P-K4, K-N1 14 Q-R5, B-R3 15 R-K1, B-B5 16 B-N5, Q-N3 17 Q-R4, P-B3 18 B-B4, KR-K1 19 N-Q2, B-B2 20 R-K3, Q-R2 21 Q-N4, P-Q4 22 $R-R 3, Q-N 323 Q-R 4, B-K 324 R-N 3$, Q-B2 25 B-R6, P-N3 26 P-KB4, P-B4 27 P-K5, P-Q5 28 N-B3, PxP 29 R-R3, Q-R2 30 N-N5, Q-K2 31 R-K1, P-B7 32 $B-B 8, K \times B 33 Q-R 8+, B-N 134 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 7+$, K-B2 $35 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 6 \dagger$, QxP $36 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5 \dagger$, K-K2 $37 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N} 38 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 7 \%, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 339 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 3 \dagger$, N-Q5 40 R-QB1, B-Q4 $41 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R} 42$ $R \times P, Q R-B 143$ R-Q2, $\quad R-B 81$ (sealed move) $44 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 545 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P} \div$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ 46 Q-N5, K-B3 47 P-KR3, K-N4 48 Q-N7, P-R4 49 RxP, R-B7 $\dagger 50$ K-N1, $R-K 8+51 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 2, \mathrm{R} / 8-\mathrm{K} 752 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 4$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ $53 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}+54 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}+55 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{R}$, P-R5 56 P-R6, B-N1 57 R-Q8, B-R2 58 R-Q7, B-N3 59 R-QR7, K-N5 60 R-KN7 Black resigns.

Comments by Hans Kmoch will appear for this game in the August issue.

Game 4
ENGLISH OPENING White: Smyslov Black: Geller 1 P-QB4, P-KN3 2 N-QB3, P-QB4 3 $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KN} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 24 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 35 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 36 \mathrm{O} 6 \mathrm{O}, \mathrm{KN}-\mathrm{K} 27 \mathrm{P} 73$, O-O 8 B-Q2, P-KR3 9 P-QR3, P-Q4 10 R-N1,

## Smyslov-Geller, Game 6



Position after 21 B-B7

P-QR4 11 N-QR4, P-N3 12 P-QN4, RPXP $13 R P \times P, Q P \times P 14 P-N 5, P \times P 15 P \times P$, $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 116 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2 \quad 17 \mathrm{BxB}, \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{B} \quad 18$ R-R1, N-E4 $19 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{NP}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N} 208 \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ $21 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R} \dagger, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 322 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q} 23 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}$, $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 524 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 125 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{P}-8426$ $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 2, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 227 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{P} 28 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 6$, $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 529 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B} 30 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 5, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 231$ $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 432 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 2, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 333 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$, R-N6 $34 \quad \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 3, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} 35 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 436$ $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 4 \div$, K-Q4 $37 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} 38 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 6$ $39 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 540 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 5, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 841 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 7$, K×P $42 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 643 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 7, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 5+47$ $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ Drawn.

Game 5

## GRUENFELD DEFENSE

 White: Geller Black: Smyslov 1 P-Q4, N-KB3 2 P-QB4, P-KN3 3 N-QB3, P-Q4 4 PxP, NxP 5 P-K4, $N \times N$ 6 PxN, B-N2 7 B-QB4, P-QB4 $8 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 2$, O-O $9 \quad \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3 \quad 10 \quad \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 211$ R-B1, R-Q1, $12 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 313 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$, P-N3 14 P-B5, N-R4 15 B-Q3, KP×P 16 $K P \times P, B-N 217 \quad Q-Q 2, R-K 118$ N-N3. Q-B3 19 R-KB2, QR-Q1 20 B-KR6, B-KR1 $21 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 222 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 523 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$, $R / 2-K 224 R / 1-B 1, R \times N \quad 25 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ 26 Q-N5, Q-Q2 $27 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 228 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$, R-N5 $29 \mathrm{PxP} \dagger$, K-R1 $30 \mathrm{BxB} \dagger, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B} 31$ $Q \times R$ Black resigns.For comments by Euwe, see page 200.
Game 6
CATALAN OPENING White: Smyslov Black: Geller 1 P-QB4, P-K3 2 P-KN3, N-KB3 3 B-N2, P-Q4 $4 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB3}, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2 \quad 5 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} 6$ $P-Q 4, Q N-Q 27$ Q-B2, $P-Q N 38 P \times P$, $\mathrm{N} x \mathrm{P} 9 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 210 \quad \mathrm{~N} x \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N} 11$ $P-K 4, ~ B-N 212$ R-Q1, P-QB4 13 P-Q5, $P \times P 14 P \times P, B-K B 315 P-K R 4, P-K R 3$ $16 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 117 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 118 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3$, P-B5 $19 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 4, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P} 20 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 421$ $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 7$ (see diagram). N-K4 $22 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Q}$, $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 6 \dagger 23 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 7 \dagger 24 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1$ Drawn.

Game 7 NIMZO-INDIAN DEFENSE White: Geller

Black: Smyslov 1 P-Q4, N-KB3 2 P-QB4, P-K3 3 N-QB3, B-N5 4 P-K3, P-B4 5 N-B3, P-Q4 6 $B-Q 3, O-O 7 O-O, P \times B P 8 B \times P, Q N-Q 2$ 9 B-Q2, PxP 10 PxP, N-N3 $11 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 3$, B-Q2 $12 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 313 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 5, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 214$ Q-Q3, N/B-Q4 $15 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B} 16 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{B}$, $P \times N 17$ QR-B1, N-N5 18 Q-K4, KR-Q1 19 N-K2, QR-B1 20 P-QR3, N/5-Q4 21 R-B2, N-B3 22 Q-K3, N/B-Q4 Drawn.

Game 8
ENGLISH OPENING
White: Smyslov
Black: Geller 1 P-QB4, P-QB4 2 P-KN3, P-KN3 3 $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 2, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 24 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 3, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 35 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 3$, $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} 6 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 37 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 48 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$, P-Q3 9 P-Q3, P-KR3 10 P-K3, B-K3 11 $P-Q 4, K P \times P 12 P \times P, P-Q 414 B P \times P$, NXP 14 N-QR4, PXP 15 NXP, N NN 16 $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 317 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 118 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{B}$ 19 R-B6, N-B3 20 Q-R1, R-B1 $21 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$, $B \times R 22 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 523 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 424$ R-K1, Q-Q5 25 N-N5, QxQ $26 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$ 27 N-B3, B-Q2 28 R-QB1, P-QR4 29 B-N7, R-QN1 30 B-B3, R-QB1 31 N-K2 Drawn.

The match nature of this Challengers Round lacks the excitement and glamour of a tournament. But the games are so important that we are giving them all for the record as here, though a number will also appear with annotations.

## Entertaining and instructive games annotated by a famous expert.



## (2) INTERNATIONAL

## ISRAEL 1964 Olympiad at Tel Aviv <br> Ingenuity Wasted

In this game, problems arise in the early part of the middle game to which there may or may not be a perfect solution. Black attempts an ingenious one, but without success.

## RUY LOPEZ

| R. Garcia |  | F. R. Anderson |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Argentina |  |  |  |

Nothing exciting has transpired so far; the position seems dull. It is, how. ever, anything but that. Black may suffer from weakness on the Queen-side dark squares. And whatever measures he may take therefor lead to many problems.

$$
13 \ldots \quad \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 2
$$

This move is highly dubious. Black must rely on achieving . . . P-QB4 or else swap Bishops. But the text furthers neither plan. The Knight is quite unfavorably placed on K2 as it needs too many moves before it can control QBs.

The move . . . N-N1 serves better. but only after preparation starting with 13 . . Q-K2: e.g. 14 QR-Q1, QR-Q1.

13 ...P-Q5 is a more radical way of coping with the problems of the position: e.g. If BxB, PxB $15 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Q1}$ after which Black can choose between $15 .$. RxN 16 PxR. NxP and $15 \ldots$. Q-Q4 16 NxP, NxP with about even chances either way.


14 Q-N4
Now White threatens to blockade the enemy Queenside as the Queen cannot quickly be dislodged from QB5.

## 14... P-QR4!?

Here is Black's ingentous solution.

## 15 QxNP

P-QB3
The alternative, 15 . . . P-R5 16 BxRP, is unsound: 16 . . . P-QB3 17 $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 4, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 418 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 3$ or $16 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ 17 P - (2N3.

16 Q-R4
Else, 16 . . . P-R5 wins.

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
16 \ldots & \text { P-QB4 } \\
17 \text { Q-R4! } & \ldots .
\end{array}
$$

White is barely able to disentangle his Queen and Bishop from their awkward position. Now his Bishop can escape to QRt and so spoil Black's effort.

## 17... Q-B2

Here Black misses his best chance: 17 ... R-N1 is $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ [18 QR-N1? R-N5!], B-B4: [not 18 . . P-B5 19 $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 2$ as White then threatens mate].

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 18 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3 \\
& 19 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 1!
\end{aligned}
$$

B-B4

Now White retains his extra Pawn rather easily. The most captivating part of the game has passed.

| 19 |  | R-R3 | 23 | Q-N3 | R×P |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20 | R-K1 | R-K1 | 24 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N}$ |
| 21 | Q-KB4 | B-K5 | 25 | BxB | P-Q5 |
| 22 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 5$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | 26 | PxP | P×P |
|  |  |  | 27 | KR-QB1 |  |

White has surrendered his extra Pawn after all but has a superior position.

$$
27 \ldots \quad R / 3-K 3
$$

This little combination works poorly. though it stops 28 RxQ .27 . . . Q-N1 followed by . . . R-K1 is slightly better. So is $27 \ldots$ Q-Q1 28 B-N7, R/3-K3.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
28 \text { P-KR4 } & \text { Q-Q1 } \\
29 \text { B-N4 } & \text { P-B4 }
\end{array}
$$

Here 29 . . . R-K1 is better. The text only weakens Black's position.

$$
\begin{array}{lrr}
30 \text { B-Q1! } & R-K 8 \dagger \\
31 \text { K-R2 } & K-B 1
\end{array}
$$

Black must parry the threat, $32 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 3$.

| 32 | B-N3 | $R \times R$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 33 | $R \times R$ | $R-Q 3$ |
| 34 | $R-B 8$ | ... |

The finishing blow.


Black's last move was a blunder, but his game was lost, anyhow,

## Magnificent Manner

In this game, White holds an edge in controlled space quite a while but lacks any chance for making headway, Even the dangerous breakthrough which he eventually launches may lead only to a draw. Black misses his best defense, however, and is worn down in a tuly magnificent manner.

SLAV DEFENSE


White's rather imnocuous variation was usual halt a century ago.


There is nothing wrong with the text, but 7 . . . N-K5 is more enterprising: $8 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4$.

| $8 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B3}$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| $9 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{KP}$ |
| $10 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\ldots .$. |

White may have a tiny edge.
10 $\qquad$ $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}$
Blatk is seeking a fight; else, he can establish full equality simply by $10 \ldots$ P-B4.

| 11 Q×N | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 12 Q-K2 | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| 13 B-Q2 | Q-N3 |

As the Queen camot stay here long, $13 \ldots \mathrm{Q}$ - B 2 is more natural.

| 14 | P-QN4 | Q-B2 | 16 KR-B1 | KR-Q1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 15 | QR-N1 | P-QR3 | 17 | P-QR4 |
| $\ldots$ |  |  |  |  |

White has choked off any timely . . . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QBf}$ or . . . P-QN4 but still has only a slight edge.

| 17 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 1$ | 19 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $18 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | 20 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B4} 4$ |

Black has placed his minor pieces as actively as possible.

## 21 R-Q3

Apparently, neither player thinks 21 P-N4, N-R5 [21 . . . N-K2?? 22 P-KN5] offers White any significant progress.

| $21 \ldots$ R-Q2 | R-Q2 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 22 R/1-Q1 | R/1-Q1 |
| 23 P-R3 | P-R3 |

Now Black can meet P-N4 with $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{R} 5$ and also with . . . N-K2 follow. ed possibly by . . . N-N3-B5.

| 24 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 1$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 25 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 2$ |

Black's is not a bad move in general but is an error in that he has failed to foresee the proper defense against the ensuing dangerous breakthrough.


26 P-Q5!
27 BxB is the primary threat; Black must prevent demolition of his Kingside.

```
26 .....
```


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

## 27 PxKP!

The point: White gives up a piece but only temporarily,

```
27....
\(R \times R\)
28 RxR
N-Q5
```

Here Black errs. 28 . . . B-B3 also loses to 29 RxRt, BxR $30 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3$, PxP? $31 \mathrm{QxB} \dagger, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 232 \mathrm{P}$-B5 as Black's Queen is bottled up out of play. 28 . . RxR is correct: after 29 QxR, PxP 30 QxB, Q-N1, Black's game is tenable and he has the Pawn back: likewise after 29 PxP广, KxP 30 QxR, BxP 31 QxN $\uparrow$, K-N1. The text provokes magnificent tactical maneuvers.

| 29 | $\mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N}$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 30 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K7}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Ki}$ |
| 31 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B5}!$ | $\ldots$. |

Here is the painful shot.
$31 \ldots \quad$ Q-N1
The Bishop's only move is . . . B-B3 to counter 32 R -QS! but it also loses: $32 \ldots \operatorname{RxR} 33 \operatorname{PxR}(Q) \dagger, \mathrm{BxQ} 34 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 8 \div$, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 235 \mathrm{QxB}$, and Black's Queen is bot. tled up again-an intolerable handicap.

| 32 | $R \times B$ | Q-B2 | 34 | $K-R 2$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| P-B4 |  |  |  |  |
| 33 | $R-K 4$ | Q-Q2 | $35 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 5$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |

Did Black escape. It appears so.


36 P-N4!!
The problem move salvages White's advantage.
$36 \ldots$
R×P

36 . . . PxP fails against $37 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B}+\mathrm{f}$. K-B3 [37 . . K-N3 38 R-K6 $\dagger$ etc. 1 38 Q-B4t. K-X3 39 PxP , and then 39 ... RxP is met by 10 RxR, QxR 11 Q-B5 mate.

| 37 | Q-B4 $\dagger$ | K-N3 | 42 | R-B7 | R-K5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 38 | Rxp | Q-Q7 | 43 | RxNP | R×KNP |
| 39 | P-R4 | Q-K7 | 44 | R-N6 | K-N1 |
| 40 | P-R5 $\dagger$ | K-R2 | 45 | R×RP | R×P |
| 41 | Q×Q | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}$ | 46 | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ |  |

And White won.

## Superb Technique

Black's premature, Queen-side action fails in this game, leaving him with lasting weaknesses of which white subsequently takes advantage. There is nothing spectacular in the process, yet the game is remarkable because of White's superb technique.

## KING'S INDIAN DEFENSE

William Addison
W. Balcerowski United States Poland White Black

| P-Q4 | N-KB3 | 5 | P-KN3 | P-Q3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB4}$ | P-KN3 | 6 | B-N2 | N-B3 |
| $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | B-N2 | 7 | P-Q5 | N-QR4 |
| P-K4 | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | 8 | P-N3! | P-B3 |

$8 .$. NxKP fails as 9 NxN , BxR 10 B-Q2 gives White two pieces for a Rook. The text also, however, has its draw. backs and is inferior to the usual s... P-Bt.
$9 \mathrm{KN}-\mathrm{K} 2$
P-QN4
Black may hope for 10 PxNP. PxNP 11 NxP, NxKP ete.

$$
10 \text { P×BP! P-N5 }
$$

On 10 . . . PxP, White wins by 11 P-QN4, NxBP 12 P-K5: or 11 P-K5: at once.

11 N-N5!
N-K1
Not 11 . . NxP/3 12 P-K5 nor 11 $\ldots$ NxKP 12 BxN, BxR 13 P-B7.
$\begin{array}{llll}12 & \mathrm{~N} / 5-\mathrm{Q} 4 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4 & 14 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3! \\ 13 & \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 2 & \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{P} / 3 & 15 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}\end{array}$


The result of Black's action is purely negative as he now suffers from serious weaknesses on the Queen Rook and Queen file. Now comes precise play by White.

| 15 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | 19 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | N/K-Q5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $16 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | 20 | N -Q5 | Q-Q2 |
| $17 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | R-N1 | 21 | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}$ |
| 18 Q-Q2 | Q-B2 | 22 | P-QN4 | P-QR3 |
|  |  | 23 | P-B4 | P-B4 |

Black prevents $2 \pm \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 5$ but at the expense of further weakening of his Pawn formation.

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
24 P \times K P & Q P \times P \\
25 B \times N & P \times B \\
26 P \times P & P \times P
\end{array}
$$

On 26 . . . RxBP, Black still gets four isolated Pawns by 27 RxR, PxR.

| 27 | N-B4 | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | 29 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 6$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |  |  |  |
| 28 BxB | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$ | 30 | $\mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{N}$ |

The demise of some Black Pawn is now imminent.

| 31 | $\ldots$ | Q-KB2 | 35 | P-B5 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: | R-KN1

The final blow.
$\qquad$
Black has no other playable move, except 38 . . . Q-B2; but, on that, White establishes connected, passed Pawns by $39 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 4!$ and $40 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 5$.
39 Q-Q4
R/1-KB1 40 PxP
Resigns

## UNITED STATES

## NEW YORK 1965

## Marshall C. C. Championship

## Trouble in the Center

Failure to make a proper stand in the center one way or another steers Black into a middle game in which his King is critically exposed to attack. Tournament winner Seidman quickly develops the attack into a fine victory.

## SICILIAN DEFENSE

| Herbert | Seidman | Allan Kaufman |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
| 1 P-K4 | P-QB4 | 4 B-N2 | P-KN3 |  |  |
| 2 N-KB3 | P-QR3 | 5 O-O | B-N2 |  |  |
| 3 P-KN3 | P-Q3 | 6 P-B3 | N-KB3 |  |  |
|  |  |  | 7 Q-K2 | O-O |  |

Here $7 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}+8 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ or . . . QN -22 is more to the point. True, white can then open the Queen file and try to profit from the hole on Q5; but that does not necessarily confer a lasting advantage, as is known from similar situations in the Ruy Lopez.

$$
8 \text { P-Q4 } \quad \text { B-N5 }
$$

Now it is more difficult to make a proper stand in the center. Under the circumstances, $8 \ldots$ Q-B2 seems to be best with an eye to . . . P-K4. $8 .$. QN-Q2 with the same purpose is not so good because of 9 P-K5, N-K1 10 $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 6, \mathrm{PxP} 11$ QxPt, K-R1 $12 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5$, N-K4 $13 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 3$. Nor is the text satisfac. tory as it leads to the useless swap of this Bishop.

$$
\begin{array}{rrr}
9 & \text { P-KR3 } & \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N} \\
10 & \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B} & \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3
\end{array}
$$

After the disappearance of Black's white-bound Bishop, his weakness on his Q4 can be critical. Hence, $10 \ldots$ P-K4 11 PxKP, PxP must be avoided.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 11 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}! \\
& 12 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3 \\
& 13 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 2
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
P \times P
$$

$\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$
Now White has the edge. He holds at. tacking chances on the Kingside or, if . . . P-K4, in the center.

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
13.0 \text { Q-B2 } \\
14 \text { P-KR4 } & \text { QR-Q1 }
\end{array}
$$

The complications which may arise from $14, \ldots$ P-KR4 15 Q-K2! P-N3 offer Black comparatively better chances: e.g. 16 P-KN4, N-B3!
15 P-R5
N/2-K4 16 Q-K2 N -Q6 17 PxP RP×P

This is the right way to recapturebasically, that is, but not under these circumstances. Black does better with 17 . . BPxP to enhance the scope of his pieces.

$$
\begin{array}{rr}
18 \text { QR-N1 } & \text { P-QN4 } \\
19 \text { P-KB4 } & \text { P-B5 }
\end{array}
$$

19 . . . P-K4 is more desirable, except that it works poorly after $20 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$ !

## 20 P-K5!

Now White's advantage is very great. A decisive King.side coup impends.

$$
20 \ldots \quad \text { R-Q2 }
$$

At this turn and his next, Black can make a bid for practical chances, by N/3xP. The text provokes 21 P-K6, but white is in no hurry.

$$
21 \text { N-K4 N-R4 }
$$

In a losing position, Black submits to the inevitable without putting up any resistance. If not $21 \ldots \mathrm{~N} / 3 \times \mathrm{P}$, he ought at least try $21 . . \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 1$.


## 22 P-K6!

Naturally, White starts the attack; it immediately has murderous momentum.

$$
22 \ldots \quad P \times P
$$

Black has no chance either after 22 QR-Q1 23 PxP .

| 23 Q-N4! | N-B3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 24 QxP $\dagger$ | R-B2 |

Black may hope for $25 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5$ as $25 \ldots$ $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ at least saves the Exchange. 25 B-R3!
This intermediate move, however, still wins the Exchange. The rest defies com. ment.

| 25 |  | R-Q3 | 29 | B-K6 $\dagger$ | K-R2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 26 | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{N}$ | 30 | Q-R5 $\dagger$ | B-R3 |
| 27 | QxNP | R-B3 | 31 | B-B5 $\dagger$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| 28 | Q-K8 $\dagger$ | R-B1 | 32 | QxR $\dagger$ | Resigns |

[^7]
## Solitaine Chess

## THREE SCORE AND TEN AND STILL SCORING!

It's a long way from New York 1894. Yet, outside of a few refinements, the English Opening between Grandmaster Ossip Bernstein and Metger is as good as new. And the final "smotherino" is as delightful now as ever. The game begins with $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 42 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$, N-KB3 3 P-KN3, P-Q4 4 PxP.

Cover scoring table at line indicated. Set up position, make Black's next move (exposing table just enough to read it). Now guess White's 5 th 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

| White Played | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Par } \\ \text { Score } \end{array}$ | Black Played |  | Your Selection for White's move | Your Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 4 . . | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}$ |  |  |
| $5 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | . 5 | 5 .. | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ |  | . |
| $6 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | . 5 | 6. | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 3$ (a) |  | . . . . . . . |
| $70-0$ | . 5 | 7 . | B-K2 |  | . . . . . . . |
| 8 P-QR3 | . 6 | 8. | B-K3 (b) | .................. | . ....... |
| 9 P-Q3 | 5 | 9 . |  |  |  |
| 10 P-QN4 | 6 | $10 \ldots$ | P-B3 (c) |  | ......... |
| $11 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | 5 | 11. | Q-B1 |  |  |
| $12 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | . 5 | 12. | R-Q1 |  |  |
| $13 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | 6 | 13. | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 5$ |  |  |
| 14 Q-B2 | 4 | 14. | NxB |  |  |
| 15 QxN |  | 15.. | B-R6 (d) |  |  |
| 16 BxB | 6 | 16. | Q×B |  |  |
| $17 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 5$ | . 6 | 17.. | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{R} 4$ | . .,.............. |  |
| 18 Q-R2 $\dagger$ | . 7 | 18.. | K-R1 | . ................ |  |
| 19 RxP | . 5 | 19. | R-Q2* | ................ |  |
| $20 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 5$ | .. 7 | 20. | PxN | . . .............. |  |
| 21 RxR | .. 5 | 21. | Q×R |  |  |
| 22 NxKP | ... 8 | 22... | Resigns (e) | ................. | ........ |
| Total Score | . 100 | Your P | rcentage |  |  |

SCALE: 75-100-Excellent; 55-74-Superior; 40-54—Good; 25-39—Fair

## Notes to the Game

a) $6 \ldots$ B-K3 seems better but can be met by 7 P-Q4, giving White a powerful initiative. b) Black's best deployment is $8 \ldots \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$, followed by ... P-B4 and . . . B-B3.
c) Again, $10 \ldots$ P-QR3 with . . P-B4 and B-B3 is correct. The text is too passive.
d) Black ought to prevent $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 5$ by playing 15 ... P-QR3.
e) Black's Queen falls: e.g. $22 \ldots$. Q-Bl 23 $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 7 \mathrm{t}$. K-N1 $24 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 6 \$$ or White delivers the delightful smothered mate: e.g. $22 \ldots$ Q-B2 23 N-B7†, K-N1 24 N-R6 $\ddagger$, K-R1 25 Q-N8 $\ddagger$
*Position after 19 . . R-Q2
 etc.
$\dagger=$ check; $\ddagger=$ double check; $1 \because$ dis. check

# POSTAL CHESS CHAMPIONSHIP <br> The Eighteenth Annual Golden Knights 

THE current edition of the Golden Knights tournament is now under way, and entries are acceptable until November 30, 1965, It is conducted under CHESS REVIEW's Rules and Regulations for Postal Chess, as mailed with assignments, and with the special rules given below.

In effect, the Golden Knights is an "open" tournament, without regard to our rating classes so far as the entry goes. The ratings are calculated, however, quite as usual. We "rate" all games in Chess Review tourneys. It is an "open" tournament because we cannot pretend to "seed" candidates for a championship and because it gives the weaker players a chance to gain by experience against stronger ones.

To speed play for the first round, we group all the entries received geographically so far as possible. Otherwise, entries are matched off into 7 man groups strictly in the order of our receipt of their applications. Qualifiers to the later rounds are grouped likewise in order of qualification (except multiple entrants), but without regard to geography.

## Special Rules for the $\mathbf{1 9 6 5}$ Golden Knights Tournaments.

Lonsult the following rules whenever any question arises as to your chances lor qualifying to Semi-finals or Finals or lor weighted point score, etc.

1 CHESS REVIEW's 18th Annual Golden K゙nights Postal Chess Championship Tourmament is open to all persons living in the continental United States of America and in Canada, except CHESS REVIEW's employees, contributing editors and members of their families.

2 Any contestant who enters this tournament under a pseudonym or in the name of another person will be disqualified. All unfinished games of the disqualified contestant will be scored as wins for his opponents.

3 Two qualifying rounds and one final round will be played. In all three rounds, contestants will compete in sections of seven players. Each contestant in a section will play one game vs. each of six opponents. Forfeit wins count as game points.

4 All contestants who score 4 or more game points in the preliminary round will qualify for the semi-final round. Similarly, all qualified semi-finalists who score 4 or more same points in the semi-final round will qualify for the final round. If additional players (from 1 to 6 ) are required to complete the last section of the second or third round, these players will be selected from among contestants who scored $3 \frac{1}{2}$ points in the previous round and in the order of their CHESS REVIEW Postal Ratings at the time the last section starts.

5 Except as provided in Rule 4, contestants who score less than 4 pcints in either of the qualifying rounds will not be eligible for the announced cash and emblem prizes. Each of these eliminated contestants, however, upon completion of all his scheduled games in this tournament, will receive one free entry (worth $\$ 1.50$ ) into a CHESS REVIEW Postal Chess Class Tournament and can apply, instead, for entry to a Prize Tournament (worth $\$ 2.75$ ) at $\$ 1.50$ only,

6 A First Prize of $\$ 250.00$ and 74 other cash prizes will be awarded by CHESS REVIEW in accordance with the published schedule of prizes to those 75 qualified finalists who achieve the highest total scores (see rule 7) in the three rounds of the tournament. Every qualified finalist will be awarded the emblem of the Golden Knight upon completion of all his scheduled games. Also, the first five prizes winners will receive suitably inscribed plaques to indicate their places in the final standings of this national open Postal Chess Championship.

7 For computing the total scores to determine the distribution of prizes. each game won in the first round will be scored as 1 point: each game won in the second round as 2.2 points; each game won in the final round as 4.5 points, A drawn game will be scored as half of these respective amounts,

8 In the case of ties, if two or more finalists tie for first place, achieving the same total score, as computed in Rule 7 . then the first 2 or more prizes will be reserved for those finalists and the prizes will be awarded in accordance with the scores achieved by them in a tie-breaking match or round-robin contest in which each contestant will play not less than 2 games with every other tied contestant. Ties for other cash prizes will be broken in the same manner. Any ties which may develop in the tie-breaking contests will be played off in additional matches or tournaments.

9 The entry fee is $\$ 4.00$ and entitles the contestant to compete in one section of the preliminary round. No additional fee is charged contestants who qualify for the second or third rounds. A contestant may enter any number of sections of the preliminary round upon payment of the fee of $\$ 4.00$ per section entry provided he applies early enough so that we can place him in separate sections. Multiple entries by one person will compete and qualify as though made by separate individuals. No contestant, however, may win more than one prize, and a player who qualifies for more than one section of the final round will be awarded his prize on the basis of the total score achieved by only one of his entries. (The entry making the highest total score will be taken.) Multiple entries will be placed in different sections of each round.
10 Upon entering, each contestant agrees that the decision of CHESS REVIEW and its Postal Chess Editor in all matters affecting the conduct of the tournament, including the acceptance and classification of entries, the adjudication of games, the award or refusal of forfelt claims, the distribution of prizes and all interpretations of the rules and regulations, shall be final and conclusive.

11 Single entries can be mailed now and until November 30, 1965 (multiple entries until two months before Nov. 30). Entries mailed after that date may not be accepted.
12 Except as provided in the foregoing rules and in all other respects, this tournament will be condisted tuder CHESS REVIEW's Official Rules and Regulations of Postal Chess, including any amendments or additions thereto.


## $\$ 1000.00$ IN 75 cast palzes

FIRST PRIZE . . \$250.00<br>Second Prize $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 0}$ |Sixth Prize $\$ 40$<br>Third Prize $\quad \mathbf{\$ 8 0}$ Seventh Prize $\mathbf{\$ 3 0}$ Fourth Prize $\mathbf{\$ 6 5}$ Eighth Prize $\$ 50$ Ninth Prize $\$ 20$<br>Tenth Prize $\$ 15$ 65 Prizes - Eleventh to Seventy-fifth $\$ 5.00$ each<br>AND THE GOLDEN KNIGHTS EMBLEMS!

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 running! 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 - EXCEPT DROPOUTS.

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 Goiden 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 OTHER SIDE
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-wimner-and, at least, you'll have lots of fun. For all classes of postal players rompete 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., Chock bore if you are a newNew York, N. Y. 10023 comer to Postal Chers. Start me as CLASS

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

## Print Clearly

$\square$ Chock bere if already a reg-
istered Postalite.

## Name

Address

City No.


[^0]:    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 Aet of March 3, 1879.
    Generat Offices: 134 West 72d Street, New York. N. Y. 10023. Sales Department open datly 9 to 6 p. m. - Saturdays from 2 to 5 p. m. Telephone: LYceum 5-1620.

[^1]:    * Discussed in CHESS REVIFW at some length in 1943, by Albert Pinkus, page 118. April, and by Mikhail Rotvinnik. page 197. June-July.-Ed.

[^2]:    $\dagger=$ check; $\pm=$ dbl. check: $1=$ dis. ch

[^3]:    $14 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{N}$ !

[^4]:    * The opening may best perhaps be called the King's Indian Defensive Method vs, the Reti Opening.-Ed.

[^5]:    1 Or Scottish draughts.

[^6]:    CHESS REVIEW
    134 W．72d St．．
    Chetk if a new－
    New York，N．Y．comer to Posial Chows 10023
    enclose $\$ \ldots . .$. ．．．．Enter my name in （how many？）sections of your Postal Chess PRIZE Tournaments．The amount enclosed covers the $\$ n t r y$ fea of $\$ 2.75$ per section．Kindly etart／continue （strike out ono）mo in Cirss．

    NAME
    ADDRESS
    CITV ．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．8TATE．．．．．．．．；

[^7]:    British Chess Magazine (1964 Annual) 376 pages + xvi pages Index. Red cloth binding. Gold-blocked spine. 320 games. Covers all important events. An absolute bargain!!

    Send $\$ 3$ (bills) +10 c (stamps) to
    The British Chess Magazine Lid.
    20, Chestnut Road, West Norwood LONDON, S.2, 27, England

