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## 789 PAGES:

$71 / 2$ by 9 inches, clothbound

## 221 diagrams

493 idea variations
1704 practical variations
463 supplementary variations
3894 notes to all variations
and 439 COMPLETE GAMES!


## 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 OPENINGS: Theory and Practice

# BY 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.

## Texas - October 16 to 17

lst CavOilcade Open at Goodhue Hotel, 5495 St., Port Arthur, Texas: 5 Rd SS Tmt. 45 moves 2 hours: register by 9 AM, Oct. 16: EF $\$ 10$ \& USCF \& TCA dues: $\$ \$ 1$ st $\$ 150$ and, per EFs, 2d, 3d \& 4th \& top A, B \& C: EFS \& inquiries to Fred King, 1305 So. 13 St., Nederland, Texas.

## California - October 22 to 24

Central California Open and Qualifying Tournament at YWCA, 112217 St., Sacramento: 5 Rd SS Tmt (Rd 1, 8 Pm, Oct. 22-distant applicants, inquire about special playing time) : EF $\$ 10$ basic, $\$ 7$ if 1899 or lower in rating, plus USCF \& CSCF dues (Bargain rate to new members): $\$ \$$ guaranteed minimum fund $\$ 300$; top Californian qualifies to State Championship: EFs \& inquiries to Col. E. B. Edmundson, 210 Britton Way, Mather AFB, Calif. 95655.

## Indiana - October 23 to 24

1965 Hoosier Open at Central YMCA, 310 North Illinois Av., Indianapolis, Indiana: 5 Rd SS Tmt, 45 moves/ $11 / 2$ hours (Rd), 23; 50/2, 24: EF $\$ 7.50$ (under $18, \$ 4)$ \& USCF dues: $\$ \$ 1$ st $\$ 75,2 d$

[^0]$\$ 40$ guaranteed mimimum, also $3 \mathrm{~d} \$ 20$ and trophies to top $A, B, C$, unrated \& junior: register by 10 Am, Oct. 23: inquiries to N. L. Matthews, 238 N. 15 Av., Beach Grove, Ind. 46107.

## Maryland - October 29 to 31

6th Anmual Baltimore Open at McDonogh School, McDonogh, Maryland: 6 Rd SS Tmt, 50 moves $/ 2$ hours: Open Section: EF $\$ 8$ (under 21, \$6) : $\$ \$ 1$ st \$100, others per EFs \& trophies top 3 and tops classes: Amateur Section: EF $\$ 5$ (under $18, \$ 4$, under $15, \$ 3$ ): $\$ \$$ per EFs plus class trophies: USCF dues required, but EFs before Oct. 21, \$1 less, both sections: EFs \& inquiries to H. E. Ross, 5211 Belleville Av., Baltimore, Md, 21207.

Georgia - November 6 to 7
Middle Georgia Open at Dempsey Motor Hotel, Macon, Georgia: 5 Rd SS Tmt, 50 moves $/ 2$ hours, 15 per after: if 40 or more, also an Amateur Division (below 1800) : EF $\$ 8$ ( $\$ 6$ to full-time students) \& USCF \& GSCA dues: register by 9 Am, Nov. 6: $\$ \$$ Open, $\$ 75, \$ 50, \$ 30$ and $\$ 20$; Amateur $\$ 50, \$ 25 \& \$ 15$, trophy to highest under 16: advance $\mathrm{EF}_{\mathrm{s}}$ \& inquiries to P. M. Lamb, 779 Orange Street, Macon, Georgia.

## New York - November 13 to 14

16th Lake Erie Open at Hotel Richford, 210 Delaware Av., Buffalo, New York: 5 Rd SS Tmt, 50 moves/2 hours (adjudications early Rd each day) : EF $\$ 7 \&$ USCF dues: register by $8: 30 \mathrm{Am}$, Nov. 13: $\$ \$ 2 \mathrm{~d}$ guaranteed $\$ 100$, others per EFs: EFs \& inquiries to G. J. Mauer, 14 Rawlins St., Buffalo, N. Y. 14211.
California - November 19 to 21
Mission Bay Open at Steiner Chess Group, 3447 Ingraham St., San Diego, California 92109: 4 Rd SS Tmt: EF $\$ 7.50$ for non-masters: masters invited; inquire free accommodations and expenses: $\$ \$$ per advertisement, page 295 . Item below conjoins.

## California - November 19 to 23

Herman Steiner Memorial Tournament at Steiner Chess Group (address as in item above): 7 Rd SS Tmt: EF \$15: other details in advertisement, page 295. Item above conjoins.
New Jersey - November 19 to 21
South Jersey Amateur Open at Walt Whitman Hotel, Camden, New Jersey: 6 Rd SS Tmt, 50 moves/ 2 hours, 15 per
(Concluded on page 263)

Subscription Rates: One year $\$ 7.00$, two years $\$ 13.00$, three years $\$ 17.75$, 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.


## CHESSIC CARIES

Chessic Caries is a structural decay engendered by one's own mistakes but sometimes by the cmnning of, say, a Keres. In its last stages, it leads to mate. In these positions, your opponent is in those stages. Find the mates. Score yourself excellent if you state all ten correctly; good. if you call off nine; fair. if you mate in eight.

Solutions on page 299,


3 White to move and mate A vigovous tooth cleansing twice on each move and calling in for the professional services of, say, a Fischer before and during the game might have given Black perhaps some chances here. But, alas! he hasn't any at all, provided you proclaim the proper move.


4 Black to move and mate
The proper care will pre. vent caries; but, as is obvious here, white has neglected anything like decent precautions. Well, now, it takes proper care as well to effect the fitting penalty for White, To win is not enough. You must mate. Find the conclusive move.


7 White to move and mate Your study of the precarjousness of caissic caries must by now have convinced you that here, and despite his extra minor piece, your opponent is on his last mouthful. If not, well, we have told you so. All you need do then is to ascertain how to mate!


1 White to move and mate As we've already announced, your opponent is in the last stages of chessic caries. It is up to you, however, to prove so. Can you decry Black into permanent decay? Mind your own danger point on K1 as you do! Call off the caissic termination. Can you do it, mate?


5 White to move and mate
Here Black is attacking both your Queen and Knight, and it might seem you're in trouble. But the prognosis is he suffers from chessic earies, and has no bite. It is his position which is precarious. It is mate which will make it post-cariesous. Make your ploy?


9 White to move and mate Here Black has a supported center; and, if his development is something lacking, so is yours. Time wastes, however, and the seeds of Black's decay may mend unless you seize the fleeting moment. Now's the time-have you the power? Proclaim Black's caries!


2 Black to move and mate Here your own position is absolutely healthy. No need at all for fluoride. Just a piece down, but what's that in view of the opponent's dire caricature of caissic caries? We presume you see what we mean. If not, look some more and determine the quietus for White.


6 Black to move and mate
Were he on the move here, White might or might not retrieve his unhealthy state. You are on the move, however; and, in the caries consequence, you can wed White to a terminal leave, Disregard your men en prise. White's King is yours. See how?


10 Black to move and mate With all due care, a Keres may be able to put the caries in White's precarious situation bere. There may be more than meets the eye. If so, try the X-ray of a thoughtful analysis. This test separates the men from the boys. To score ten, separate White from his King!


## INTERNATIONAL

## Setback for Youth

Making the best showing of his life at the age of fifty-five, M. Czerniak of Israel captured a strong international round robin in Natania, Israel, by winning nine games and drawing two. Among his victims was grandmaster S. Gligorich, who, together with Y. Kraidman and A. Matanovich, finished far behind with $71 / 2 \cdot-31 / 2$.

## Outclassed

Ten representatives of Bielo-Russia played a four-round match with an equal number of East Germans in Berlin and won handily by $26-14$.

## UNITED STATES

## REGIONAL AND INTERSTATE

## Southern Championships

The Forty-fourth Annual Southern Congress, played in three divisions, drew a total of eighty contestants from seven states: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, New York and North and South Carolina. In the Open Division, Mike Valvo of New York City and Dave Truesdel of Macon, Georgia, tied for premier honors with $6^{1 / 2} 2^{-1 / 2}$ each, the nod for first going to Valvo on a tiebreak. Bob Leonard, $61 / 21 / 2$, won the Amateur Division, and a tiebreak enabled William V. Duffy to head a 5.2 quintet in the Reserve Division. The event took place at Cape Kennedy, Florida.

## In Old Kentucky

In the sixteen-player Ashland (Kentucky) Summer Open, Charles T. Boggs of Huntington, West Virginia, was successful with a clear first of $41 / 2 \cdot 1 / 2$. John Spencer of Columbus, Ohio, and Dr. Alex Darbes of Charleston, West Virginia, placed second and third respectively.

## Popel Wins

Stephan Popel swept five rounds to take the Minneapolis Aquatennial Open, attended by sixty players from California, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota


Arthur B. Bisguier in a simultaneous exhibition, with clocked games, at Pacific Beach, California, studies position against Eugene Agero as Alfred P. Coles III concentrates on his next move. Bisguier scored $91 / 2-1 / 2$ drawing with Jose Tossas. He scored 22.2 in a regular exhibition against San Diego, with draws by Gary Davis, A. P. Coles III, David Book and John Harrigan. The events were to celebrate the founding of the Herman Steiner Chess Group of San Diego by John Alexander (see mention in "Where to Play Chess," page 304).
and Wisconsin. Runnerup was Gerald Ronning, $41 / 22^{1 / 2}$, while Curt Brasket, James H. Young, Laszlo Ficsor, Robert Johnson, Jerome Nolte and David Tykwinski figured in a six-way tie at 4-1. Brasket was third on Solkoff points.

## Arkansas Rendezvous

First place in the Arkansas Open, in which several states were represented,

## CHESS and CHECKERS Supplies

High Quality Catalln and Plastic Checkers Plain or Grooved . . All Sizes
CHESS Sets . . . Wood . . Catallin . . Plastlc All Sizes . . All Prices CHESS and CHECKER Boards Folding, Non-Folding, Regulation or Numbered
CHESS-CHECKER Timing Clocks
All Merchandise Reasonably Priced SEND FOR FREE CATALOG
STARR SPECIALTY COMPANY
1529 South Noble Road,
Cleveland Helghts, Ohlo 44121
went to Al McAuley of New Orleans, $4^{1} / 2^{-1 / 2}$, when he edged Ronnie Taylor of Fort Smith. Arkansas, also $41 / 22^{-1 / 2}$, on a tiebreak. Third to fifth with $4-1$ each were Eric Bone, James Stallings and Steve Balsai. William Canaday won the Reserve Section. A total of 62 players took part.

## ARIZONA

"Humphrey's Kings," a four-man Phoenix team captained by Edwin Humphrey, won the Arizona Chess League championship, followed by a Fort Huachuca squad led by John M. Yates. Fifty-nine players participated in the League matches.

## NEW YORK

In the time-honored and traditionally powerful Manhattan Chess Club title tournament in New York City, Pal Benko incurred no losses and breezed through to an 11-2 victory. Former United States champion Arnold Denker and N. McKelvie (who distinguished himself by
numbering among his victims Denker, Bisguier and Kevitz) tied for second and third at 9.4; Arthur Bisguier came in fourth with $81 / 2.41 / 2$; Asa Hoffmann scored 8.5 to take fifth; and recent Manhattan champion B. Zuckerman (forfeiting three games) and veteran A. Kevitz were deadlocked at 7-6 to share sixth and seventh.

John Westbrock of Brooklyn scored $7-2$ in the New York State Open at Ithaca, ahead of Ivan Theodorovich of Toronto, $61 / 2-21 / 2$. Five players tallied 6.3 each and placed in the following order after a tie-breaking preference: August Rankis, Allan Kaufman, Mitchell Salzberg, Peter Graves and J. Pamiljens. Rankis and Salzberg are former state champions. There was an attendance of 32 players.

## FOR SALE

BOOKs from the magnificent collec. tion of GRANDMASTER LARRY EVANS, now being catalogued, will shortly be available to the general chess public. Each book to be iden. tified by a serially numbered book plate. Those interested contact the STEINER CHESS GROUP OF SAN DIEGO, 3447 Ingraham St., San Diego, Calif. 92109.

# Catalog of THE CHESS COLLECTION 

(Including Checkers)

John G. White Department Cleveland Public Library
This publication is a reproduction, in book form, of the card catalog of "the largest and foremost Chess literature collection" in the world. More than 15,000 items include printed books in every edition of each title whenever possible; an extensive collection of periodicals, many of which were short-lived and are now hard to find; and nearly 1,000 manuscripts, some of which are centuries old. Important literary works referring to chess and checkers are also in the collection.
Catalog entries are arranged in three scquences: by authors of all items in the collection; by chess subjects; and by checkers subjects.
26,000 cards, 2 volumes
Price: $\$ 115.09$
$10 \%$ additional charge on orders outside the U. S.
Descriptive material on this catalog and a complete catalog of publications are available on request.

## G. K. HALL 8 CO.

70 Lincoln St., Boston, Massachusetts 02111


Samuel Reshevsky congratulates Manhattan Chess Club President Jacques Coe for the club's winning the Met League Championship (story, page 261, September). Vice-President Morris Steinberg is in center.

Photo by Beth Cassidy

## LOCAL EVENTS

California. The Fifteenth Anmual OpenAir Chess Festival of Sonoma was, as usual, a gala affair. The Expert-A Division was won by John Blackstone; the B Division went jointly to Elwin Meyer and N . Rosen; and the C Division was divided by Manuel Rivera, Jerry Long and N. Johnson. Each of these players received a trophy. Mrs. Joan Oyler bagged the women's title, and P. Quirarte the junior event. The Kolty Chess Club of San Francisco, helping to swell the crowd of competitors to 269 , won special awards for its large number of entries and best scores.
In the twenty-three-player City Terrace (Los Angeles) Chess Club championship,

## ON THE COVER

Robert J. Fischer shows a fierce intensity as he makes a move to be forwarded via teletype to his opponent in the Capablanca Memorial totirnament in Havana. He played from the Marshall Chess Club in New York.

Press, radio and TV made much of the story, including editorials by the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal as Fischer denied a visa to Cuba (story, page 259. September) arranged this novel tournament-from-afar method.
As we go to press, Fischer has had some good results (see games, page 316) but faltered especially toward the end. In a press interview, he stated: "It's a question of how soon I'll crack up." The point is a four or five hour game takes eight or nine hours over teletype; all games have run to at least eight hours; and Fischer has concentrated, on the move and off, all the way.

Steve Parker made a perfect 500 score, impressively in front of Neil Hultgren, John Earnest, Steve Rains and Steve Szirmay, each $31 / 2-1 / 2$.
Attended by 74 competitors from many parts of the state, the Monterey Open saw five players finish with $41 / 2^{-1 / 2}$ each. Tiebreaks crystallized their final positions into the following order: Earl Pruner, Philip Smith, Koit Tullus, R. M. Jacobs and Roy Hoppe.
Conn. The New London title went to Harry Lyman with a thumping score of 15.0. Second in the thirty-six-player event was Al Weissman with $121 / 2-21 / 2$, while Jose Espino scored $111 / 2-31 / 2$ to place third.
Idaho. In the Boise Chess Club Championship Idaho titleholder Dick Vandenburg proved invincible with 10-0, followed by Gary Wickberg, 8-2.

Later, Boise narrowly defeated Canyon County by 8.7 in a triple-round match. Wicksherg. Skirmants, Lee and Joslyn

## 6th Annual Armed Forces Tournament

Top ranking players of the Army, Sea Services (Navy, Marine, Coast Guard) and Air Force compete for the Thomas Emery Championship Trophy at the American Legion "Hall of Flags," Washington. D. C.. November 6 to 13. The American Chess Foundation, 1372 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 10018, underwrites the tourney expenses. Candidates for this year have been selected by now; for next, those wishing to compete can inquire of the Foundation, local recreation officers or USO representatives.
each registered 2-1 for Boise; for Canyon County, 2-1 scorers were Cross and Waterman.

Illinois. A Gompers Park (Chicago) tourney saw Garry DeFotis capture first with a $5-1$ score. Second and third respectively on tiebreak points were M. Pimsler and P. Wolf, each $41 / 2^{-1} / 2$. A field of 44 took part.

The Argonne Knights placed first in the Chicago Industrial Chess League with a perfect $9-0$ match record, in front of the Argonne Bishops, 8-1. Third were the Western Electric Chargers, 7-2.
Indiana. The "Norbert Matthews Open" was won by Paul Richman of Indianapolis, 5.0. Theodore Pehnec was second with

## READERS' FORUM

## ARRAIGNMENT?

I have a new solution to an old problem which I think may interest you and your readers.
I came across the Sam Loyd arrangement (below) on page 86 of the book. "The Scientific American Book of Mathematical Puzzles and Diversions" by Martin Gardner (Simon and Schuster).


1 White to move - mate in 3
2 Remove Knight - mate in 4
3 Remove Knight and Pawn on R2 mate in 5
This book states that the original Loyd problem consisted of these three arrangements. Years later, a German expert found that, by removing White's Rook (only), then White could mate in six.
I have recently found a new solution which differs from that of the German expert. In other words, by removing White's Rook, then White can mate in six in two ways.

I gave this problem to a friend, James Cogi: ll of Nantucket, who also found the same solution as mine.

It occurred to me that this might make an interesting problem for your readers.

Herbert I. Terry
Nantucket, Mass.
Solutions, page 295.

[^1]

Col. B. E. Glawe, Chief of Staff of Air University, presents plaques to Air Force team qualifiers (closewise from center) 1st A1C Ross F. Sprague, Hickam Air Force Base; 2AC Walter Harris, Mather AFB; 3d A2C Alfred W. Kershaw, Tinker AFB; 4th A2C David M. Lees, James Connally AFB (either 3 or 4 missing from photo); 5th TSgt George Krauss, Westover AFB; and reserve A2C Samuel G. E. Bowlin, Walker AFB. Team of five will represent AF in 6th Annual Armed Forces Chess Tournament (see page 292). The USAF has won for the past two years. Larry Kiefling of the Huntsville (Alabama) Chess Club directed the five-day tournament.

## A book the chess world has been waiting for

# PROFILE OF A PRODIGY: 

The Life and Games of BOBBY FISCHER

by FRANK BRADY<br>Editor, Chessworld Magazine



Bobby Fischer burst on the chess world before he was twelve, and in his short life he has become one of the most electrifying, well-known, and controversial players of all time. Now, in Profile of a Prodigy, Frank Brady (who has known Bobby Fischer since he was eleven years old) presents the first authoritative account of Fischer's life and chess career.
Many of the facts, observations, and quotations have never appeared in print
before. And in his close-up portrait, Brady refutes, or at least explains, some of the aspects of Bobby Fischer's personality that have been publicly criticized. In addition to the biography, Mr. Brady has annotated, with diagrams, 75 of Fischer's most important games, ranging from his first tournament wins at the age of eleven to his games with Botvinnik, Reshevsky, Tal, Smyslov, Petrosian, and others.
250 pages. 75 diagrams
\$6.50

The World's foremost publisher of books on CHESS
DAVID McKAY COMPANY, INC., 750 Third Ave., New York 10017
$41 / 2 \cdot 1 / 2$, and James Bishop third with 4-1. The event attracted 30 players. Norbert received a beautiful framed certificate, signed by the officers of the Indianapolis Chess Club, in appreciation of his unstinted efforts in behalf of chess.

Louisiana. We note a compliment from Jude F. Acers, publisher and editor of the Chess Commentator: "I . . . say that Chess Review is the best English publication on chess . . . '"

Massachusetts. With an 11.0 tally, George Krauss Jr. bowled over all his opponents in the round robin for the championship of the Springfield Chess Club. Eli Bourdon and Roland Johnson trailed at 9-2.
Minnesota. Winner of a Minneapolis "chess tornado"-or should we say "cy-clone"?-was James H. Young, $31 / 2,-1 / 2$. Runnerup in the fourteen-player tourney was Laszlo Ficsor, 3-1.
Minnesota. In the Major Section of the Twin Cities Open, attended by 26 contestants, P. Quillen was a clear first with $41 / 2-1 / 2$, followed by Brendan Godfrey and Gary Boos, each 4-1. Godfrey became runnerup on a slim median edge. Four players scored $31 / 2 \cdot 11 / 2$ each and finished in the order mentioned on tie-breaking points: Warren Stenherg, Laszlo Ficsor, Vernon O. Bragg and Sheldon Rein.

Missouri. First place in the St. Louis Dis. trict Tournament was shared by John B. Freeman and Carl Spies, each $71 / 2 \cdot 11 / 2$. The event was a round robin.

Eighteen players comprised the field in the Kansas City Amateur Open, which was annexed by Bob Spies with a clear first of $5-1$. Scores of $41 / 2-11 / 2$ were made by Ernest Chace, Mike Davidson and Bill Kenny.
Nebraska. At Lincoln City, the Invitational Championship was gained by Alexander Liepnieks, $41 / 2 \cdot 11 / 2$, while the Open Championship was credited to Willard Hogan, 7-1. Both events were round robins.
New Jersey. The winning team in the TriCounty Industrial Chess League was Westinghouse (Bloomfield) thanks to an outstanding record of ten matches won, one drawn, one lost. RCA, 9-3, was next.
A tourney at the Jersey City YMCA was pocketed by John Grefe with a $41 / 2 \cdot 1 / 2$ score. Second was M. Riff, $31 / 2 \cdot 11 / 2$. A dozen players participated.
New York. With a score of 7.1 and a superiority in Swiss totals, Andrew Soltis of Long Island City retained the New York City Junior Championship. Mark Yoffie, also 7-1, was adjudged second. The "under 16 " title was gained by Salvatore Matera, and the "under 13 " by James Lane.

# NOW READY! Chart of the Pirc Defense (1. P-K4 P-Q3) 

Because of the rapidly increasing popularity of the Pirc (or Yugoslav) Defense we have had more requests for this chart than any other. Add it to your repertoire!
Based on hundreds of tournament games by the world's greatest players. The actual winning percentage shown for every move. With CHESS CHARTS you can pick the best move at a glance. The scientific way to learn the chess openings. They are the charts used by champions.
Charts now available. Simply check off and mail:
() 1. THE PIRC DEFENSE
() 7. The French Defense
() 2. The Sicilian Defense
() 8. The Queen's Gambit
() 3. The Ruy Lopez Opening
() 9. The English Opening
() 4. The Nimzo-Indian Defense
() 10. The Blackmar-Diemer Gambit
() 5. The King's Indian Defense
() 11. The King's Gambit
() 6. The Caro-Kann Defense
() 12. Bird's Opening

Price: $\$ 2$ each; any 3 for $\$ 5.50 ; 6$ for $\$ 10$; or all 12 for $\$ 19.50$.

CHESS CHARTS, P. O. Box 5326, San Diego, Calif. 92105

Ohio. In the forty-six-player Eighth An. nual Cincinnati Open, first and second were shared by Richard Verber and Adam Rueckert, $41 / 2^{-1 / 2}$ each. Next, dividing third and four with 4.1 each, were David Wolford (who held Verber to a draw in the last round) and Andrew Wishnek. The women's prize was won by Greta Olsson and the Junior by Gregg Stark. A total of $\$ 207$ in prize money was distributed.
Oklahoma. Jack Shaw of Albuquerque, New Mexico, won the twenty-four-player Senior Division of the Oklahoma City Open, with D. Ballard in hot pursuit. Junior kingpin was Tommy Amburn.
Pennsylvania. Thanks to an upset victory over Pal Benko, James Gore came in first in the Philadelphia Championship. His $51 / 2-1 / 2$ score was matched by Joseph Shaffer, but Gore commanded a slight median superiority. As highest ranking Philadelphian, Shaffer was declared city champion. Pal Benko, heading a group of play. ers with 5-1, found himself in the unusual position of lagging in third place. A large crowd of 112 was attracted to the event.
A round robin for Pittsburgh Chess Club supremacy was credited to L. W. Gardner, 7-2, followed by Dr. F. A. Sorenson, $61 / 2-21 / 2$, and Alex Spitzer, 6.3.
Pennsylvania State University staged the first annual Penn State Open, in which Robert W. Walker scored $41 / 2^{-1 / 2}$ to outrank a field of eighteen players. Second and third respectively were P. Szusz and O. Frink.
Texas. The San Antonio title was seized by sixteen-year-old John Dunning with a clear first of 4-1, despite his forfeiture of one game because he had to work! He has been playing chess only two years. Tallies of $31 / 2 \cdot 11 / 2$ in the seventeenplayer tourney were registered by Homer H. Hyde, Gary Caruso, Tom Snow and Blake W. Stevens.

## Brilliancy Prize

Bruce Hayden of immortal fame for his story, "Brilliancy Prize" (page 82, March 1962), likes this game from the English Counties and District Corre. spondence Championship 1954.

## TWO KNIGHTS DEFENSE

| T. J. Smith |  |  | J. E. Morton |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White |  |  |  | Black |
| 1 P-K4 | P-K4 | 13 | Q-K2 | Q-R4 |
| $2 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | N-QB3 | 14 | B-Q2 | P-Q6 |
| $3 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | N-B3 | 15 | Q-K3 | N-Q5 |
| 4 P-Q4 | PxP | 16 | $\mathbf{R \times B}$ | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N} \dagger$ |
| $5 \mathrm{O}-0$ | NxP | 17 | QxN | Q x Q |
| 6 R-K1 | P-Q4 | 18 | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} \dagger$ | R×R |
| 7 BxP | QxB | 19 | PxQ | $\mathbf{P \times P}$ |
| $8 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | Q-QR4 | 20 | B-B1 | R-Q8 $\dagger$ |
| $9 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{N}$ | B-K3 | 21 | K-N2 | P-QN4 |
| $10 \mathrm{~N} / 4-\mathrm{N} 5$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | 22 | P-QN4 | P-QR4 |
| 11 NXB | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{N}$ | 23 | P-QR3 | P-B4 |
| 12 RxP | B-Q3 | 24 | P-B4 | BPxP |
|  |  |  | Resigns |  |

## Arraignment Solutions

Mate in 6 (German): 1 N -B3, B-K8 [1 PxP? 2 P-N4 mate] $2 \mathrm{NxB}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 5$ [or 2 . . . PxP 3 N-B3, P-R8(Q) $4 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 4$ mate] 3 P-R3, K-R4 $4 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 3, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 55$ N-B4. P-R4 6 N-N6; (Terry \& Coghill) 1 N-B3, B-K8 2 NxB, K-R5 3 P-R3. K-R4 4 K-B6, K-R5 5 K-N6, P-R4 6 $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ :
Mate in 5: 1 R-K7, B-N8 2 R-K1, B-R7 $3 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 54 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 6$ and $5 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 4$;
Mate in 4: $1 \mathrm{PxP}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 82 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 4, \mathrm{BxP}$ 3 RxB and $4 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 3$ or 1 . . B-B4 2 $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 4, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 23 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 4 \uparrow$, $\mathrm{BxR} 4 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 4$; Mate in 3: $1 \mathrm{RxP}, \mathrm{BxR} 2 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ and 3 $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 4$ or $1 . \ldots \mathrm{BxN} 2 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 3 \dagger$ and 3 P-N4.

Chess lessons for beginners have been offered free by the San Antonio Chess Club. Joske's department store, largest in San Antonio, provided facilities, and local newspapers, radio and television lent their unstinted support. When chess is boosted like this, the game is bound to flourish.

Wisconsin Chess director Ernest Olfe is quite ill. Friends may write to him at W 156 N 8317 Pilgrim Road, Menomonee Falls, Wisconsin.

Washington. In the Seattle Open, James McCormick and Viktors Pupols, both of Seattle, survived five rounds without a loss and tied at $41 / 2 \cdot 1 / 2$. Median scoring gave victory to McCormick. Bracketed at 4-1 were Kent Pullen, Colin Aykroyd, Andy Schoene and Jerry Wolfe, who finished in the order listed on median tiebreaking. The tally of participants ran to a neat 32 .

## FOREIGN

## Australia

W. Geus emerged as clear first in the thirty-eight-player Shepparton Open with $51 / 2-1 / 2$, and P. Dozsa, losing only to Geus, followed as clear second with 5-1.

In the round robin for the Tasmanian title, R. N. Ledger and $O$. Weber were first and second respectively with $41 / 2,1 / 2$ and 4-1.

Sydney University predominated as usual in the annual inter-university contests, this time posting a 26.2 match score and far outdistancing the Adelaide and Queensland teams, which tied for second with 17-11 each.

## Indonesia

Bachtiar lost his national title in a match with Ong Yok-Hwa despite capturing the first three games. Thereafter the challenger allowed his rival no more wins and came through with a $61 / 2 \cdot 41 / 2$ triumph.

## Ireland

In the national championship, M. F. Littleton bested H. McGrillen and R. Deiseach, his nearest competitors in the seventeen-man Swiss.

## South Africa

A round robin for the Johannesburg title saw V. Southern on top with 7-2, a full point ahead of R. F. Griffiths.

## Switzerland

The famed Coupe Suisse, or Swiss Knock-out Championship, went to E. Walther as a result of his defeat of Dintheer in the last round.

## HERMAN STEINER MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

November 19 to 23, 1965.

## Incorporating the Mission Bay Chess Open Tournament

November 19 to 21, 1965.

## Grandmasters PAL BENKO and LARRY EVANS will participate.

TOURNAMENT DIRECTOR - GEORGE KOLTANOWSKI.
A Seven round and a Four round Swiss will be played conicurrently.
Rd. 1 8:00 p.m., Fri. Nov. 19th 45/2 (Registrants whose entry is received by noon, Nov. 18th, may elect to play this round at 12:00 on Saturday, Nov, 20)
Rd. 2 7:00 p.m., Sat., Nov. 20th 45/2 Rd. 3 9:00 a.m., Sunday, Nov. 21 45/2
Rd. 4 2:00 p.m., Sunday, Nov. 21 40/2 After round 4, prizes for the Mission Bay Chess Open Tournament will be distributed and play among the remaining entrants will continue.
Rd. 5 9:00 a.m., Monday, Nov. 22 40/2 Rd. 6 2:00 p.m., Monday, Nov. 22 40/2
Rd. 7 10:00 a.m., Tues., Nov. 23 40/2
PRIZES - FOR THE HERMAN STEINER MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT. $\$ 500.00$ 1st; $\$ 350.00$ 2nd; $\$ 250.00$ 3rd; $\$ 200.004$ th; $\$ 175.00$ 5th; $\$ 150.00$ 6th; $\$ 125: 007$ th; $\$ 75.00$ 8th.
FOR THE MISSION BAY CHESS OPEN TOURNAMENT. $\$ 100.00$ 1st; $\$ 50.00$ 2nd; $\$ 25.00$ 3rd. In all cases money will be split on ties. There will be class prizes if funds are available.
ENTRY FEE - $\$ 15.00$ for Herman Steiner Memorial Tournament, $\$ 7.50$ for Mission Bay Chess Open. No fee for Masters, for whom free accommodations and modest expense money may be available.
Sponsoring Organization STEINER CHESS GROUP OF SAN DIEGO, 3447 Ingraham St., San Diego, Calif., 92109.
Enjoy a stay in beautiful San Diego's vacation wonderland, just prior to the AMERICAN OPEN in Santa Monica.

## Composition Tourney

Third FIDE-Album Competition for best problems and studies during 1962-4 is to close December 31, 1965 (entries must be in respective tourney directors ${ }^{\circ}$ hand by that date).

Two-movers to Dr. A. Chicco, Via Tavella 3-21, Genova, Italy;

Three and more movers: (a) models to Dr. A. Mandler, Praha 6, Slavickova I, Czechoslovakia: (b) logicals to Dr. W. Massmann, Jiel, Auguste-Viktoria Strasse 14, West Germany; (c) others to K, Flatt, Zurich 2, Rieterstrasse 35, Switzerland;

Studies to Dr. H. Staudte. Bad Codesberg, Schubertstrasse 3, West Germany;

Fairy Chess (a) helpmates to M. Myllyniemi, Tapiola, Hakamaki 4 KI 28 , Finland; (b) selfmates to Ing. F. Hladik, Pisek, Svatoplukova I, Czechoslovakia; (c) others to C. E. Kemp, 17 Craven Rd., Reading, Berkshire, England.

Entries to be submitted on diagrams in 4 copies, thin paper, solution (to begin) under diagram (and continued on separate sheet: paper no larger than $14 \times 20$ cm . Any number of compositions may be submitted.

## TOURNAMENT CALENDAR

(Concluded from page 289)
after, adjudications after 5 hours: register by 8 PM, Nov. 19: EF $\$ 5$ (juniors $\$ 3$ ) \& USCF dues: open to all below master rating: trophies for $1 s t, 2 \mathrm{~d}, 3 \mathrm{~d}$, top A , B, C, D and unrated and woman \& book prizes: special hotel rates: inquire L. E. Wood, 1425 Sycamore St., Haddon Heights, N. J.
Georgia - November 26 to 28
Peach State Open at Massey Junior College, 181 Peachtree NE, Atlanta, Georgia: 6 Rd SS Tmt, 40 moves $/ 21 / 2$ hours: register by 11 am , Nov. 26: EF $\$ 7.50$ \& USCF dues: $\$ \$ 1$ st guaranteed $\$ 100 \&$ trophy, others per EFs, trophies to 2d, 3d \& top A, B, C, unrated and woman: inquiries to John G. Warner, 4266 English Oak Drive, Apt. U.4, Doraville, Georgia 30040.

## Connecticut - November 27 to 28

2d USCF Futurity, restricled to those who never won a USCF-rated tourney, at YMCA, 315 Pearl St., Hartford, Conn. 5 Rd SS Tmt, 45 moves $/ 11 / 2$ hours: EF $\$ 6$ ( $\$ 5$ if revd by Nov, 20) \& USCF dues: trophies to 1st and to top A. B, C: starts noon: EFs and inquiries to F . Townsend. 10 Bermuda Rd., Wethersfield, Conn. 06109.

Texas - November 27 to 28
Texas Candidates \& Texas Open, 25 Rd SS Tmts at Commodore Perry Hotel. Austin, Texas: Candidates EF \$7, top 4 qualify for state championship; Open EF $\$ 5: \$ \$$ and trophies per EFs: inquiries to Dr. A. Gutierrez, 7712 Lazy Lane, Austin, Texas 78757.

## Game of the Month

## THE TAHL - LARSEN MATCH

The Tahl-Larsen Match was the most exciting of all the matches in the Challengers Round so far. The progress and the result were both a great surprize.

Notwithstanding Larsen's great performance in the Interzonal Tournament, it was generally accepted that, in a duel, he was no match for his Russian rivals. Robert J. Fischer was considered the only equivalent opponent from the West. But, since Fischer defaulted, another had to defend the colors of the Western area. A rather questionable situation. But nature is adaptive. Apparently, Larsen felt so, and he has given a brilliant accounting of his honorable duty, both in his match with Ivkov which he won convincingly and that with Tahl which he lost narrowly.

In this latter match, Larsen took the lead twice when playing White but lost it immediately with Black. With the score at 4.4, it looked as if the Danish Grandmaster was again to take the lead. He came into a favorable Rook ending, but Tahl held his own, under particularly difficult circumstances. The game ended in a draw, and thereupon the tenth game was to decide.

From other opponents, one could probably expect a cautious, mutual scamning before embarking
upon action. With so critical a game at hand, few are apt to take great risks. Such considerations, however, are not valid for temperamental players like Tahl and Larsen. They play for everything or nothing. Tahl likes to sacrifice, and Larsen does nothing to prevent him. But Tahl's sacrifices are different from those of most combinational players. He would be prepared to sacrifice his King if the FIDE rules did not forbid.

Tahl has his own philosophy of sacrificing. While most grandmasters sacrifice usually only if they are convinced of the correctness of the combination, whether convinced by calculation or by intuition, Tahl has a different point of departure: he sacrifices if he cannot prove the sacrifice is incorrect. Between these two conceptions is a broad body of no-man's land.

Thus, in this tenth game. At various moments, it is not clear how matters would have gone had Larsen played differently. But this is Tahl, full length. He is not a mathematician but a fighter.

For the rest, this magnificent game speaks for itself. In the labyrinth of possibilities, Larsen certainly did not find the right road. But it is dubious that the absolutely right road will ever be found in this difficult game.

SICILIAN DEFENSE

| Mikhail Tahl |  | Bent Larsen |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Soviet Union |  |  |  | Denmark |
| White |  |  |  | Black |
| 1 P -K4 | P-QB4 | 3 | P-Q4 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $2 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | N-QB3 | 4 | NxP | P-K3 |
|  |  | 5 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | P-Q3 |



Larsen offers a Scheveningen Variation but with the King Knight held back so that White cannot transpose into the Rauser Variation ( $6 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{KN} 5$ ).

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
6 & \text { B-K3 } \\
7 & \text { P-B4 } \\
8 & \text { Q-B3 }
\end{array}
$$

With the Queen Bishop on K3 instead of the Rauser position on KN5, White deploys differently, but does aim to castle Queenside.

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
8 \ldots 0 & O-O \\
90-0-0 & Q-B 2
\end{array}
$$

Black's Queen cannot remain on the file with White's Rook; already $10 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$ was threatened.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
10 \mathrm{~N} / 4-\mathrm{N} 5 & \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 1 \\
11 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KN} 4
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3 \\
& \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2 \\
& \ldots
\end{aligned}
$$



Position after 13 BXN

Here 13 . . . P-K4 looks tempting. Tahl had the following continuation in mind: 14 P-N5! B-N5 $15 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 3$, with these subvariants:

1) 15 . . BxR $16 \mathrm{PxN}, \mathrm{KBxP} 17$ $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 5, \mathrm{PxB} 18 \mathrm{NxB} \uparrow, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 119 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 1$ winning;
2) $15 \ldots$ PxB 16 PxN, PxN 17 PxB, PxP† $18 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1, \mathrm{BxR} 19 \mathrm{PxR}(\mathrm{Q}) \dagger, \mathrm{QxQ}$ $20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 421 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 1, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 122 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 5$.

Careful examination of the last line must lead to the conclusion that White has the better of it. The activity of Black's pieces is very restricted, and his Bishop is in danger, So Black's material advantage counts for little.

14 P-N5
15 B-Q3!
$\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$
This move prepares the wonderful combination to follow.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 15 . \mathrm{C} \text {. } \quad \text { P-N5 } \\
& 16 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 5 \text { ! }
\end{aligned}
$$



Typical Tahl! He gives an N for "possibilities." There is no one great danger for Black, but there are tens of small threats and, in general, it is extremely difficult to parry all those vague threats.

$$
16 \ldots
$$

$\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{N}$
17 PxP
Now White threatens both 18 Q-K.t and the well-known double Bishop sac. rifice: e.g. $17 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 118 \mathrm{BxP} \uparrow, \mathrm{KxB}$ 19 Q-R5 $\dagger$. K-N1 $20 \mathrm{BxP}, \mathrm{KxB} 21$ Q-R $6 \dagger$. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 122 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 6$ etc.

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

Forced in view of the threats mentioned.

18 QR-K1


After 18 . . . B-Q1, it is not at all easy to prove the correctness of the White sacrifice. Perhaps, Tahl had the following continuation in mind: $19 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5$, $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 420 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$, and

1) 20 . . N-K5 $21 \mathrm{BxNP}, \mathrm{KxB} 22$ Q-R6个, K-B2 [or $22 \ldots$ K-N1 23 P-N6, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 224 \mathrm{KN}-\mathrm{N} 1$ etc. $] 23 \mathrm{QxPt}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 1$ 24 B-K2! B-K2 25 B-R5 , K-Q1 26 $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 6$-after which it is very doubtful that Black can hold his own;

## 2) 20

$\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 221 \mathrm{BxN}, \mathrm{PxB} 22$ P-Q6§, K-R1 23 R-K8, QxP $24 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$, $\mathrm{QxP} \div 25 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1$ etc.

Tahl himself gives the very pretty variation: 18 . . . B-Q1 19 Q-R5, N-B4 20 BxNP! ? NxB $\dagger 21 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1, \mathrm{NxR} 22 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 6$ ! KxB 23 QxPt, K-B3 $24 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 7, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$ ? 25 $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 8(\mathrm{~N})$ mate.

True, these variations are not forced; but they illustrate White's tactical possibilities.

## 19 P-KR4 <br> $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 2$

After 19 . . N-B4, White continues his attack with $20 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5, \mathrm{NxB} \dagger 21 \mathrm{QxN}$, I3-B1 22 P-N6: e.g. 22 . . . R-K2 23 PxP广. KxP 24 RxR, BxR 25 Q-KN3.


20 BxBP
This "obvious" move is not so simple as it seems.

## 20 . . .

## $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{B}$

Another fine Tahl variation runs: 20 . . . N-B1? $21 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 122 \mathrm{BxP}+$ : NxB 23 P-N6, RxP 24 RxB! etc. $21 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B} \quad \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 4$
Here again is an obscure point in the game. How does white justify his sac. rifice after 21 . . R-B2? Doubling Rooks is insuflicient: $22 \mathrm{R} / 1-\mathrm{K} 1, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 4$ ! Better is 22 RxR, KxR and then not 23 Q-K+ on account of 23 . . . N-B1 but 23 P-R5 and anything can happen.
Tahl's own suggestion, however, is perhaps stronger: 22 RxR, KxR 23 P-N6t, PxP 24 P-K5.

## 22 Q-K4


"Poor Pete! The only guy in the club he can beat is moving out to the coast."

Probably, till now, Larsen had relied on the saving move 22 . . . $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$. In that event, however, there follows: 23 RxR, NxR 24 P-N6! PxP [or 24
$\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{R} 325 \mathrm{PxPt}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 126 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 6] 25 \mathrm{QxP}_{\text {r }}$ $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{KB} 126 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 1$, and White wins.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
23 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{N} & \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B5} \\
24 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 3 & \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 6
\end{array}
$$

Black has better here: 24 . . . BxP 25 PxP, RxB 26 QxR, BxR 27 QxQNP. He loses but puts up stouter resistance.
After the text, White, having recovered his piece, wins easily.

| 25 Q-K2 | Q×R | 28 R×P | Q-Q3 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 26 Q×R | P×P | 29 Q-B4 | $R-K B 1$ |
| 27 R-K1 | $R-Q 1$ | 30 Q-K4 | $P-N 6$ |

Black's last is desperation.

| 31 RP×P | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 8 \dagger$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| $32 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 5 \dagger$ |
| $33 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |



Trust Tahl to win with dispateh.

| 34 | B-B5! | Q×B | 36 Q-K6 $\dagger$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | | K-R1 |
| ---: |
| 35 |
| R-K8 $\dagger$ |$\quad$ R-B1 $\quad 37$ Q-B7 $\quad$| Resigns |
| ---: | :--- |

## CERAMIC-TILE GAME TABLE

A life-time chess board... a handsome piece of furniture!


Genuine cefamic tile - hard as stone, smooth as glass! Non-glare matte finish. Impervious to drinks, cigarette burns, or scratches. Black and white playing squares $2 \frac{1}{4} \times 21 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ to ac commodate tournament pieces; tan tile border. Felt cushions under board. $19 \% /^{\prime \prime}$ square. $\$ 24$. Pedestal base turns board into sturdy game table and unique end table, $243 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ high - perfect height for play or end table use. Black porcelain base $\$ 24$. Satin-finish brass base $\$ 29$. Shipped express collect. Satisfaction guaranteed. Send check or money order to:
ARY TILE CO. - LOGO7 MANCHESTER • SI. LOUIS, MO. $6312 ?$


## PROFESSORS AND PRACTITIONERS - Some Encores

The amazing chain of correlates and counterparts brought on stage during the life of this series in Chess Review demonstrates the intercomnecting logic and development in chess practice and history. The following examples show how painstakingly a novel theme is first produced, then in time perfected and experimented with in other thematic fields and suddenly crops up in practical play. It thus comes to fruition with all the traditional knowledge from the artistic plane. Then again, to close the circle, the question may arise if some position from practical play did not inspire the "study" in the first place.

To turn from the dialectical to the figurative explanation, here are examples stretching from 1892 to the present day.

The following diminutive jewel appeared in "The Boys Own Paper" in 1892 and is historic Americana.
H. Otten, New York


White to move and win*
The study is impressive for its utmost economy sharply outlining a distinct idea and so made the round throughout: world literature.
1 P-R5 $\quad \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 1 \quad 3 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 5 \dagger$ ! $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$
$2 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 5 \quad \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3 \quad 4 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 4 \quad \mathrm{~B} 4 \mathrm{R} 5$

The Pawn can no longer be stopped; nor can it after $3 .$. KxP; and White has choice of $4 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 6$ also.

In both variations, the King obstructs its own Bishop. This idea has been handled in various fashions since: by Berger in 1859 but from Otten's and with more material; by Neustadtl in 1904; and by Rinck (given below).

Otten's theme was enriched with an added element, though not in crystalclear form, by A. Mouterde, reaping an award in the study tournament of Sydvenska Dagblad Snaellposten, 1914.
(See diagram, top of next column)
If it were not for surphus "wood" standing around to prevent side varia-

[^2]A. Mouterde, France


White to move and win
tions, this would be a perfectly executed model of a splendid parallel to Otten's theme.

| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 6$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ | $4 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R8}$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| $2 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 5!$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R8}$ | 5 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 4!$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| $3 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 6$ | $6 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 8$ |  |

In 1980, a contempory German conHoisseur displayed a more polished gem in the Viemmese Neue Freie Presse, probably the ultimate form of this idea.

Paul Heuaecker 1930


White to move and win
$\bar{\dagger}=$ check $;=$ dbl. check; $\S=$ dis. ch.

This study combines the same block. ing of lines, an invitation to divert, but all in most economical form. White queens in two moves. but Black can at any time open a defensive duct by . . . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$.

## 1 B-R7!

First a try to divert the Bishop.

$$
1 \ldots B \quad B-R 8
$$

A proper evasion $\ddagger 1+, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 6$ is met. by $2 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$.
$2 K-N 1$

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
B-B 6 & 3 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2 \\
& 4 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 4!!
\end{array}
$$

B-R8

Nothing short of a bombshell!

$$
4 \text {, . . }
$$

## BxB

t. . PxB permits $5 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 3$.

5 K-Q3! B-N7 6 K-K4!
Heuaecker eliminated the need for additional Pawns in Mouterde's work by relocating the Black King and the White Bishop. (There for example the Black Pawn on QR4 is to prevent the dual solution: $3 .+\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 64 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 4$.

Rather than leave well enough alone, along came Roumanian Rusenescu trying a sophisticated improvement included by Revista de Sah among studies most representative of Roumanian production -a disservice to her far more successIul composers of really original themes, for this complicates the quintessence of Heuaecker's terminal presentation in a retrogressive development rather than improvement. Still, we all try to paraphrase; so let's accept it thus.

Eugen Rusenescu 1951


White to move and win
1 P-R6
B-B6
On 1. . P-B4. White has $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$, B-B6 3 P-K6 (not $2 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 6!$ ).

```
\(2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4 \quad \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P} \quad 3 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5 \quad \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}\)
On 3 . . . PxP, white has \(4 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 4\) !
```


## 4 B-B5! <br> $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{B} \quad 5 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 7$

Notwithstanding these artistic reservations, however, it is exactly the same blocking manuever as in $4 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 5$ ! which plays an amazingly corresponding part in a match game played thirteen years later in Solingen. Germany, 1964. Kieninger


Evertz
In this involved position, replete with thrusts and counter thrusts, Black has a safely aggressive measure in 1 P-B4. Instead, he took it too easy

$$
1 \ldots B \times P ?
$$

His intention clearly is, on 2 P -R6, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$ followed by $3 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 7, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$.

## 2 B-B4!!

Black resigned after 2. . KxB 3 $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 6, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 54 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 7, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5.5 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{RS}(\mathrm{Q})$. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 66 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 1, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 67 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 1 \div, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 5 \mathrm{~S}$ $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 49 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 4+$. K-N6 $10 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 3$.

Furthermore, the Roumanian experi, ment in abstract art inspired a life-sized reflection in a Bucharest tournament in 1959.
D. Mayer


## P. Seimeanu

Here again exact technic is required: 1 R-R3 $\dagger, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 32 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 8, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 7 \dagger$ and 3 KxP wins for Black.
(Concluded on page 320)

## Solutions to ANNOUNCE THE MATE

No. 1 Mate by 1 QxP + RxQ 2 R-Qst etc. No. 2 Mate by $1 \ldots$ P-Bit etc.
No. 3 Mate by 1 QxB ${ }^{+}$etc.
No. 4 Mate by 1 . . . BxP etc.
No. 5 Mate by 1 QxPt. KxQ 2 Pxp ctc.
No. 6 Mate by $1 \ldots$ Q-K7* elc.

No. 8 Mate by $1 \ldots$ RxPt 2 PxR, Q-Qsi etc. 2 B-K3. Q-Q7 is mate, or 2 N-K゙2. Q-QS. or 2 Q-K2, Q-N6t etc.
No. 9 Mate by $1 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} \mathrm{s}$ etc.
No. 10 Mate after 1 . . . Q-Q5: e.g. 2 P-K゙3. QxP 3 PxQ. BxP 4 Q-122, RxB ete or 3 $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ or $3 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{QxP}+\mathrm{QxQ}$. HxB etc.


SWEET IS THE USE OF THIS ADVERSARY
A model of perfection is the brevity, Botvinnik-Alatorzev, from Leningrad 1934. Simple, sharp and incisive play by Botvinnik, long before he annexed the word title, prophesies the coming of a new champion. The game, a Queen's Gambit Declined, begins with $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$, P-K3 2 P-QB4, P-Q4 3 N-KB3, B-K2 $3 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$, N-KB3 $5 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5$, O-0 6 P-K3.

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 8th move, then expose it. Score par, if move agrees; zero, if not. Make move actually given, Black's reply. Then guess White's next, and so on. COVER WHITE MOVES IN TABLE BELOW. EXPOSE ONE LINE AT A TIME


## NEW PORTABLE ROLL UP DEMONSTRATION BOARD WITH TRIPOD and BASE



New heavy-duty leg design with pull up tab

Convenient tab closes legs in a jiffy no juggling no folding

Rugged, stable leg construction, stays when set

Lightweight, compact, with non-warping metal roller. Convenient carrying case. Height adjustable. No club can afford to be without one. The screen is of durable vinyl, with bonded backing (over-all size $40^{\prime \prime} \times 40^{\prime \prime}$ ). Grey and white squares, 4 inches. Visible from distance. No installing. Just set it up and use.

## Special Features

Silhouetted chessmen, rigid plastic, red and black readily visible and with stems which secure easily in pockets


No. 999
$\$ 48.00$

## Order from CHESS REVIEW

134 West 72d St., New York, N. Y. 10023


Miniature games are the hors d'oeuvres of chess.

District Championship, Bochum, Germany
Black tries for a Pawn by 9 . . P-K4, gets two-but--!

## SICILIAN DEFENSE

Dr, R, Cherubim
White

| 1 | P-K4 | P-QB4 | 5 | N -QB3 | P-K3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | N-KB3 | N-QB3 | 6 | B-K3 | B-N5 |
| 3 | P-Q4 | Pxp | 7 | B-Q3 | Q-R |
|  | NxP | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |  | O-0 |  |

Better 8 ... O-O. White has the attack on $8 \ldots$ BxN 9 PxB, QxBP $10 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5$, Q-K4 $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 112 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 5$.

| 9 | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N}$ | P-K4 | $12 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 4$ ! | QxP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | P-QR3! | $P \times B$ | $13 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5$ ! | O-O |
| 11 | P×B | $Q \times P$ | $14 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 7$ | R-N1 |
|  |  |  | $15 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 1$ |



White mates: e.g. 18 . . . P-KN3 19 Q-R6. P-BL $20 \mathrm{QxP} \dagger$ and $21 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 7$ etc.

Budapest 1956
White fiddles on the Queenside in the opening to no good avail.

## NIMZO-INDIAN DEFENSE

| Honfi |  |  |  | Gipslis |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White |  |  |  | Black |
| 1 P -Q4 | N-KB3 | 6 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | N-R3 |
| 2 P-QB4 | P-K3 | 7 | P-QR3 | $\mathrm{BxN} \dagger$ |
| 3 N -QB3 | B-N5 | 8 | QxB | NxP |
| $4 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | P-B4 | 9 | P-QN4 | N/4-K5 |
| $5 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | O-O | 10 | Q-B2 | P-QR4 |
|  |  | 11 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |  |


$\dagger=$ check; $\ddagger=$ dbl. check; $\xi=$ dis. ch.
$11 \ldots$....
A shrewd shot which White overlooked.
$12 \mathrm{KxN} \quad \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 5 \dagger \quad 13 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 3$
A King is the open is usually done for; but $13 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1$ loses very simply to $13 \ldots \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3$ or $13 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 314 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$, $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 7 \dagger 15 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 1, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 6 \dagger$ etc.

| 13 | Q | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| $14 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2 \dagger$ | $16 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5 ?$ | P 44 |

16 P-K3 seems best here, returning the Bishop for the Pawn. Now White becomes thoroughly entangled.

| 16 | P-Q4! | 19 | K-R4 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 6$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17 P-K4 | QP×P | 20 | Q×P | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B4} \dagger$ |
| 18 B-K2 | P-B5 $\dagger$ |  | Resigns |  |

## Rome 1965

This game will hardly rehabilitate the Dutch but does show a brutal retort to a blunder.

| Fricker | Nestler |
| :--- | ---: |
| White | Black |

1 N-KB3 P-KB4 2 P-B4 ....

The gambit with $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ is strong.

| $2 . \ldots$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | 5 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 3 | P-KN3 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | 6 | $0-\mathrm{O}$ |
| 4 P-Q4 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $7 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{K} 1$ |  | A standard line in the Dutch.

8 R-K1 N-K5 | 9 | Q-B2 | Q-N3 |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
|  |  | 10 N-QN5 |
|  | $\ldots .$. |  |

Too optimistic.

| $10 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 3$ | $11 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ <br> 12 NxN | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ <br> KBPxN |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


$13 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$
The blunder. 13 N -R3 is adequate, and 13 BxP loses to $13 \ldots$ Q-B2.

$$
13 \ldots \quad \text { P-K6! }
$$

White resigns, facing either . . . QxQ or ${ }^{\prime}$. . . PxP ${ }^{\dagger}$ etc.


# Matches Toward The World Championship The Larsen-Ivkov Quarter Finals at Bled 1965 

By Dr. PETAR TRIFUNOVICH



Dr. Trifunovich

Danish Grandmaster Bent Larsen won too convincingly from Yugoslav Grandmaster Bora Ivkov $51 / 2-21 / 2$.

For, after Ivkov's great success in The Tournament of Peace in Zagreb, this was a huge surprise. The latter may be the key, though, to the match result. Ivkov felt too sure, relaxed in his preparations and began to play non-stop chess in tournaments and club competitions, from January till match time and came into the latter tired and chess-stale.

Style was also supposed to favor Ivkov, whose bent is objective, positional play like Capablanca's, whereas Larsen's is fantasy, combinations and tactics like Tahl. But the course and the results of the match played a wicked joke on all prognostications. Analysis of the games permits the conclusion that the fight was not pitched on Ivkov's level. Larsen imposed his
manner of play on Ivkov, who didn't know how to stand up to it. It was all combinations and tactical play. It seems Ivkov played poorly and out of his norm. Games 1, 4 and 8 are abnormal, full of errors and oversights. Ivkov's style reached its true expression only in the one small exception, that of Game 7.

Larsen came to the match well prepared and thoroughly rested. He tamed his well-known fantasy, letting it free only when conditions were favorable. Nor did he resort to his known predilection for original, but very often dubious, ideas in the openings. He cancelled from his repertory of openings all those of doubtful value, forgetting his fond move 1 P-KB4 which he had used so gladly formerly. It must be that this change caught Ivkov off-guard. He'd planned to utilize the weaknesses in Larsen's play, as it was known before the match, for easy wins. But the weaknesses didn't appear, and Ivkov was not ready for a hard fight. This was the prime factor.

Thus, Larsen's play became much surer while he retained his characteristic style. He won really by conquering himself in the preparations and, in the match, his new front surprised Ivkov and threw him offstride.

Nonetheless, the first game was of great and perhaps decisive influence. Both players competed as to who could make more mistakes. Ivkov made the last. The second game was only balsam for tranquilizing the nerves after that tight fight. In the third, Larsen again had a win but didn't roast it thoroughly enough in analysis during adjournment and made an incredible mistake on the first move on resumption. (His deficiency in analyzing an adjourned position appeared in Game 1, and it will cost him a win over Tahl.) In an even position in Game 4, Ivkov overlooked a piece.

By now, no one believed Ivkov could repair his standing, except Tahl who, in an interview, declared he had hope Ivkov could still win. Perhaps, it was revenge on Larsen. Larsen had, as second for Fischer at Bled 1959, learned to give interviews for newspapers and had before this match stoutly declared he would eliminate all opposition and play the final match with Petrosyan for the World Championship. It is not easy to uphold such a modest declaration.

Ivkov, defused, loses Game 5, and Larsen has a three-game advantage. The match is won. But, in Game 7, content with playing for a draw, Larsen quickly reveals he is not at home in such play.
lvkov wins in his routine positional style. But it is Ivkov's swan song.

In Game 8, Larsen decides to take some risk and adopts the Alekhine Defense, which has nearly disappeared from opening praxis as incorrect. But it is questionable if it is truly any hazard for one forcing a "groggy" opponent who can hatdly keep his footing. His ploy brings success to Larsen. Ivkov commits incredible mistakes even in the opening, and Larsen is as devastating as a hurricane. So Larsen collects his necessary $51 / 2$ points and gains the right to meet Tahl who, a day before, had eliminated Lajos Portisch.

Game 1 RETI OPENING
B. Larsen
Denmark
B, Ivkov
White
Yugoslavia
1 N-KB3
2 P-KN3
Black
P-Q4

With this very elastic move. White can, depending on Black's continuation, later choose favorably between $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB}$ (Reti Opening), $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ (Catalan Opening) or $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ with $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ (King's Indian Reversed).

| $2 \ldots$ | P-QB3 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 3 B-N2 | N-B3 |
| 4 O-O | B-N5 |

Ivkov defends this move as very good against the Reti. It is clear Black will concede the Two Bishops, but he has no problems in developing.

## 5 P-B4!

Larsen has used this move before. It is stronger than the customary $5 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3$ followed by $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$.

$$
5 \ldots \quad P-K 3
$$

Accepting the Pawn is not advisable: $5 \ldots \operatorname{PxP} 6 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 3$ :

1) $6 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 47 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 5$;
2) $6 \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 37 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KN} 5$;
3) $6 \ldots \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 47 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 48 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 4$, $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 5 \quad 9 \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KN} 4, \quad \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 3 \quad 10 \quad \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 1$, and White regains the Pawn favorably; or he can concede the Pawn for superior development by Pirc's $7 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ \& P-Q3!

6 PxP
$B \times N$
Black wants to keep a symmetrical Pawn position by . . . BPxP; but $6 \ldots$. BPxP is met by $7 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 5$ followed by $\delta$ Q-N3 or $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4 \div$. So he swaps.

A symmetrical Pawn position gives the Two Bishops fewer chances, most significantly in the ending. LarsenDamjanovich, Zagreb 1965 ran: 6 $\mathrm{KPxP} 7 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3$, $\mathrm{BxN} 8 \mathrm{BxB}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 38$ $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3, \quad \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} 10 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1 \quad 11 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$, QN-Q2 12 P-R3, P-QR4 13 Q-B2, Q-N3
$14 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 415 \quad \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5, \mathrm{~N}$-R4 16 $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4+$

| 7 B $\times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $10 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 8 N-B3 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |
| $9 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $12 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ |
|  |  | $13 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |

Black's Knight is hunting for a more active place.

The position is even. White cannot profit by his Two Bishops as the posi.
tion is closed. So both players must respect the rule of equilibrium as even the slightest violation can be severely punished. For some moves, both play for small improvements in their positions and wait watchfully for a chance. 14 K-R1
$\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 5$
Now White has the move, P-B4; but he can achieve his end better by 14 P-R3 followed by K-R2.

$$
14 \ldots
$$

N-Q5
This is a patent move for the level position with "threat" of simplification and exchange.

15 P-QN4
15 Q-R4 permits $15 \ldots$ RxN: and $16 \ldots \mathrm{NxP}$.
15 ....
N-N3

Black has ideally posted his pieces on the Queenside where play must develop because of the opened file. The white King Bishop is out of play.

## 16 P-K3

White cannot forever suffer the molester on his Q4.

| $16 \ldots \mathrm{Q} 3 \mathrm{~N}$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | $\ldots$ |

$17 \mathrm{NxN}, \mathrm{PxN}$ is not good; it concedes QR5 for Black's Knight.

| 17 | Q-Q2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $18 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\ldots$ |

White cannot avoid simplification.
$18 \ldots \quad \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3 \quad 20 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} \quad \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$

White aims to provoke . . . B-K2 where the Bishop is less active and then to trade Rooks.
21
22
B-K
23 P-QR4 N-Q3
22 RxR $\dagger$ QxR 24 B-KB3

The Bishop must rally to defend the Queen Rook Pawn.

| $24 \ldots$ | Q-B3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 25 | B-Q1 |
| 26 Q-B3 | $B-N 4$ |

A crude tactical oversight. $26 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1$ is correct, and then White retains some small chances with the Two Bishops in the ending.


Because of the threat of 27 P-Q5§, White cannot avoid the swap . . NxB.

## 27 P-N5

White still has to play $27 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1 . \mathrm{He}$ has complete equality on $27 \ldots \mathrm{NxB}$ 28 QxN. Larsen is, however, very fond of and quite expert with the Two Bish.
ops and cannot reconcile himself to concede them cheaply. So he starts combining, but his Pawn sacrifice ought to cost him the game.
$27 \ldots \mathrm{PxP}$
$P \times P$ 29 Q-R1
Note White's mate threat.

$$
29 \ldots \quad N / 5-Q 3
$$

Now all is defended and, with a Pawn plus, Black finds himself suddenly in a winning position.

| 30 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 5$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5 \S$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 31 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KN} 3$ |
| 32 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N}$ |

32 . . . P-K4 is stronger; but both players are now in severe time pressure. They start on mutual compliments, i.e. mistakes, especially Ivkov who cannot stop. After this exchange, Black must reckon permanently on White's domination over the black squares.
33 NPxB
$\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 6$

## 34 P-K4

....

The King Bishop cannot escape because of the threat of . . . N-K7t and $\cdots$ Q-R8广.

$$
34 \ldots \quad N / 3-N 4
$$

Now all Black's pieces begin to desert his King. Perhaps, Black has forgotten that Knights do not retreat so quickly as Bishops can attack. 34... $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 4$ or $34 \ldots \mathrm{NxB}$ retains his winning position.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
35 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 8 \dagger & \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 2 \\
36 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4
\end{array}
$$

This last move is a new weakening. $36 \ldots$ Q-Q2 is correct.

$$
\begin{gathered}
37 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 2 \\
37 \underset{\mathrm{Q}}{3} \mathrm{Q} 2 \text { is still correct. } \\
38 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 8
\end{gathered}
$$

Ivkoy continues to err. Correct now is $38 \ldots \mathrm{Q}$ - 2339 QxQ , NxQ $40 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$, N-B4 with an even game.

$$
39 \text { B-K1 Q-N8 }
$$

Now Black ought to lose. He has more hope for salvation in $39 \ldots \mathrm{Q}$ R6.

$$
40 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5!
$$

## KPxP

After 40 . . QxB $41 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B6} \mathrm{~F}_{\text {, }}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 3$ 42 P-R4, Black will be mated.

$$
41 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}
$$

The sealed move.

$$
41 \text {. . . }
$$

## PxP

Black must take because of the same mate threat mentioned previously. 42 B-Q2
Now Black's King is suddenly under fire from all White's pieces, and he has no adequate defense. See comment on Black's 34 th move.

$$
42 \ldots
$$

## QxP

Other defenses are no better. Black must free his K5 for his Knight.

The most promising seems to be 42 .. Q-N5 to bring the Queen nearer the King by . . . Q-Q3. But then White forces mate: $43 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 6 \div$ ! KxB it $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 8+$. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 3$ [or 44 .... K-N4 $45 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 7 \dagger$ ] 45 BxPt, K-N4 46 Q-N7t! KxB tor 46

[^3]K-B5 47 Q-N3 mate] 47 P-B4! [with threat of 48 Q-N5 mate], Q-K2 [or $47 \ldots \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 7+48 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 3] 48 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 7 \%$. K-N5 49 Q-R3 $\dagger$, KxP 50 Q-N3 mate.
This variation illustrates how clearly hopeless Black's position is. But now comes the greatest surprise.


43 B-B4
It seems incredible that Larsen did not find in adjournment analysis the problematical win hidden in this position (as he failed in Game 3, remember). The solution is $43 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 6 \mathrm{t}$ : KxB 44 Q-R8市. K-N3 45 P-R4! Q-K5 [or 45 $\therefore$ P-B5 $46 \mathrm{BxP}+\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 447 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 7+$ and 48 QxQ] 46 QxPt, K-N2 47 Q-N5t, K-R2 48 BxQ, PxB 49 P-R5. What Ivkov intended to play, it is hopeless to guess. 43....
$\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 5$
Black can do nothing more and could be satistied with a draw.

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
44 \text { B-K5 } \dagger & \text { P-B3 } \\
45 \text { Q-K7 } \dagger & \text { K-N1 }
\end{array}
$$

45 . . K-N3 permits $46 \mathrm{BxP}+, \mathrm{KxB}$ 47 Q-R7\%, K-N4 48 P-B4! K-N5 49 P-R2 ${ }^{7}$.

## 46 B-B4

On 46 BxRP, Black can defend with $46 . . \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B5} 47 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B4}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 7$.
$46 \ldots \quad$ Q-B7 48 Q-K7 $\dagger \quad K-N 1$ 47 Q-Q8 $\dagger$ K-N2 49 B-N3 N/N-Q3
The other Knight returns to the defense.
50 Q-Q8 $\dagger \quad K-N 2 \quad 52$ Q-Q8 $\dagger \quad K-N 2$ 51 Q-Q7 $\dagger \quad K-N 1 \quad 53$ B-R4 $\ldots$.

Larsen over-estimates his attack and now runs into danger of losing for the second time. He ought to take a perpetual.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
53 \\
54 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 7 & \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 2 \\
\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B3}
\end{array}
$$

In time pressure, Black misses the correct $54 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 4$ ! 55 BxRP, N-Q3 with the winning chances on his side.

| 55 QxBP | $\mathrm{N} / 2-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $57 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $56 \mathrm{BxP} \dagger$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | $58 \mathrm{Q} 6 \dagger$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 1$ |
|  |  | $59 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 7$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |

Or 59 . . Q-B2 60 BxRP! QxB 61 Q-K7 mate.

60 Q-N6

## Resigns

A very interesting game, fraught, with fight but also rife with mistakes; so hardly a game for the world chess cham. pionship.

## Game 4 SLAV DEFENSE

| B. Ivkov |  |  | B. Larsen |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 N-KB3 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{KB3}$ | $3 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B3}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $4 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
|  |  | $5 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | ... |

The consensus of experts now is that allowing the Anti-Meran Gambit: 5 $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 5$, PxP $6 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 4$, is a correct and much stronger continuation.

$$
\begin{array}{rr}
5 \ldots & \mathrm{QN}-\mathrm{Q} 2 \\
6 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3 & \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}
\end{array}
$$

With Black leading in the match, one expects a quiet and solid defense. But Larsen prefers the active and risky Meran defense.

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
7 \text { B×BP } & \text { P-QN4 } \\
8 \text { B-Q3 } & \text { B-N2 }
\end{array}
$$

This variation is known in theory as the Accelerated Fianchetto, often adop. ted by Bogoljubov but abandoned because of the refutation in PachmanVesely 1953.

| 9 | P-K4 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 5$ | $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$ |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 10 N-R4 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | 12 NxP | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |

This move is Larsen's innovation, but it is of doubtful value. Pachman-Vesely ran: 12 . . NxN 13 PxN, Q-R4 14 Q -K2, P -QR3 $15 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}, \quad \mathrm{BxP} 16 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5$, $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 217 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 218 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 319$ Q-R5, R-KB1 $20 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 4$ with a winning position for White.

## 13 PxB

P-QR3
In Game 6, Larsen, dissatisfied with analysis of the text, tried a different line: 13. . NxBP 14 B-N5 $: ~ K-B 1 ~ 15$ $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 4, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 316 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 317 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 318 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 219 \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{B} 1$; but white can still obtain the advantage with $20 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 4$ !
$14 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$
$\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{BP}$
$15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$
R-QB1

15 ...O-O loses quickly to $16 \mathrm{BxP}{ }^{t}$, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{B} 17 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5 \div$.

## $16 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5$

$16 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ ! leads to an irresistible attack. White threatens $12 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 4$, and Black still cannot castle.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
16 \ldots \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 4 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3 \\
17 & \ldots
\end{array}
$$

Another lukewarm move. 17 Q-R5 of fers more chances for an attack.

| $17 \ldots \mathrm{~K}$ | $\mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{N}$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| $18 \mathrm{~B} N$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| $19 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B4} 4$ |

Black is forced to weaken his Pawns but as compensation gets active play.

> 20 PxP e.p.
> $21 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$
$R \times P$

And now Ivkov misses the stronger 21 B-K3, with threat of 22 B-Q4, which forces 21. . NxB $22 \mathrm{PxN}, \mathrm{BxB} 23$ QxB, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$. White then stands better as the Black Pawns are subject to attack.

$$
21 \text { B-Q3 }
$$

Q-N3
....
Now Black shrewdly ignores the seeming threat, $23 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 4$. White ought to try $22 \mathrm{BxN}, \mathrm{BxB} 23 \mathrm{QxQNP}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 3: 2 t$ P-KN3. Q-Q1 25 QR-B1! For, though the danger of Black's Bishop on the
long diagonal is great, White with a Pawn plus can defend hopefully.

| $22 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| 23 Q-K4 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 2!$ |
| 24 Q-K3 | $\ldots .$. |

White desists from his idea: $24 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 7^{4}$, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 225 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 326 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 4$ as Black can then profit from the bad position of White's moveless Queen.

| $24 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| :---: | ---: |
| Now the threat is $25 \cdots$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$. |
| $25 \mathrm{QR-Q1}$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 4!$ |
| $26 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $\ldots .$. |

The trade is forced: for 26 Q-R3. R-N3 leaves White no good defense for his Bishop on Q3.

| $26 \ldots$ | $R \times B$ | 28 | $R \times R$ | $Q \times R$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| 27 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | 29 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{KN} 3$ |
| Not 29 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{RP}$ | 30 | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$. |
| 30 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |  | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{KB} 4$ |  |

A draw seems inevitable. Who could expect White to resign in one move?

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

White is blind. $31 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 5$ is correct.


The Bishop has no move because of the threat of $32 \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 5$.

One more example of how badly lykoy played in this match.

## Game 8 <br> ALEKHINE DEFENSE

| B. Ivkov |  | B. Larsen |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | :---: |
| 1 P-K4 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{KB3}$ | $3 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q4}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |  |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $4 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | PxP |  |

Black tries an unustal but infertor continuation. Its only advantage is that the opponent must already fend for himself. Theory recommends $4 . ., B-N \overline{5}$.
5 NxP
6 Q-R5!
P-K3

White's move seems premature and bootless but forces weakening on Black's Kingside.

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
6 \ldots & P-K N 3 \\
7 \text { Q-B3 } & Q-K 2
\end{array}
$$

The plausible defense, $7 . \quad$ Q B3, is not good. For 8 Q-KN3: leaves Black's Queen a target for attack, by B-KN5 or N-Q2-K4,

## $8 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$

Tahl proposes 8 P-KR4: with attack on the weakened Kingside. Positional experts suggest $8 \mathrm{P}-Q R 3$ preparing for $9 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$.
8.

N-Q2

9 B-QB4
$\mathrm{N} / 4 \times \mathrm{N}$ 10 NXN
....
Black has the better play after 10 PxN, NxN 11 PxN, Q-B4! $12 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ $13 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B}+, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 214 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{QB} 3$.


White wants to prevent Black from bastling but has viewed the coming complications superficially and now nust lose material.

$$
12 \ldots \quad Q-R 5!
$$

Black has reckoned correctly.

$$
\begin{array}{lc}
13 & \text { B-N4 } \\
14 & \text { B-N3 }
\end{array}
$$

14 Q-K2 with threat of $15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5$ t doesn't help either: 14 . . B-Q2 15 $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 5, \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 316 \quad \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 3, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 317 \quad \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{F} 3$, QxP or $15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 3, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 316 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 3$. Black wins in either line.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
14 \ldots & \text { Q-N4 } \\
15 \text { P-QR4 }
\end{array}
$$

White. who had looked ahead just this far, is sure all is well. Black must re. treat his Queen, White thinks.


What now follows is more like wood chopping than chessplay.

$$
15 \ldots \quad \text { P×B }
$$

No exclamation mark here. One need not be a Grandmaster to see Black is selling his Queen for two Rooks and $A$ Bishop, Facing this "bargain," White might just as well resign immediately,
$16 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Q} \quad \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} \dagger \quad 18 \mathrm{PxP} \quad \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ $17 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2 \quad \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} \quad 19 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 4 \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ !

Black not only defends his Queen Bishop Payn but also opens diagonals for both Bishops.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 20 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} \\
& 20 \cdot \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3 \text { is also good. } \\
& 21 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4
\end{aligned}
$$

The text is stronger than 21
BxKP $22 \mathrm{BxP}+, \mathrm{RxB} 23 \mathrm{QxB}$.
$\begin{array}{lrrrr}22 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 6 & \mathrm{P} x \mathrm{P} & 24 & \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 3 \\ 23 & \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3\end{array}$
23 QxP R-QB8 $25 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 2 \quad . .$.
Or 25 QxNP, BxP; or $25 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 6$.
$25 \ldots$
R-KN8
$26 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2$
. . .

Or 26 QxNP, R-Q1 $\div 27 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{~K} / 8-\mathrm{Q} 8$,

| $26 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5 \dagger$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| 27 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| Resigns |  |

On $28 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 3$, Black also has 28
B-N4 $\dagger$ etc.
After this game, Ivkov can sleep quietly while Larsen must still think about Tahl.

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 Cashio Street
Los Angeles 35, California
OAKLAND YMCA CHESS CLUB
2101 Telegraph Ave., Oakland,
California 94612: Phone: 451-5711
Open Fridays at 7 PM
STEINER CHESS GROUP
OF SAN DIEGO
3447 Ingraham, 92109: Ph. 276-4644 Associated Clubs: Edward Lasker, Pacific Beach; Harry N, Pillsbury, San Diego; Frank J, Marshall, La Jolla; Jackson W. Showalter, Clairemont; Dudley H. Hosea, Point Loma. Tues, thru Fri: 7:30 to midnight Sun., Mon. \& Wed. 1:30 PM to 6 PM Club Director: Grandmaster Pal Benko; Asst. Director: Jose Jesus Mondragon, former champion of Mexico

BROWARD COUNTY CHESS CLUB
1440 Chateau Park Rd, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida: 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

CHICAGO CHESS CLUB
64 East Van Buren Street Chicago 5, Illinois
Phone: WE 9.9515
GOMPERS PARK CHESS CLUB 4222 W. Foster, Chicago 30, Illinois Fridays 7:30 PM - 11:45 PM Phone: PE 6-4338

OAK PARK CHESS CLUB Stevenson Fieldhouse, Taylor and Lake Streets, Oak Park, Illinois
Wed, from 7; Sat, noon to 6
HAMMOND CHESS CLUB
Hammond YMCA
5719 Hohman Avenue
Hammond, Indiana
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 Springfleld, 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
QUEEN CITY CHESS CLUB
210 Delaware Avenue, Buffalo 22
New York: Phone: TL- $3-4300$
Open daily 12 noon to 2 AM
ELMIRA CHESS CLUB
at the Central YMCA
corner of Church and State St.
Elmira, New York 14905
NASSAU CHESS CLUB
Brierely Park Game Room, Clinton \& Dartmouth St., Hempstead, New York Meets every Wednesday evening

HUNTINGTON T'NSHIP CHESS CLUB Old Fields Inn, 81 Broadway, Greenlawn, New York: meets Thursday 8 PM Phone: AN-1-6466.

WIN AT CHESS
Develop your chess knowledge and ability with the best chess books at moderate prices. Write for free catalogue.

Chess Book Club
Box 11154
Dallas, Texas 75223

JAMAICA CHESS CLUB
155-10 Jamaica Avenue, Jamaica, New York: open dally, 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.
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: Cl-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 dally 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, Ohlo 45401
7 PM, Friday evenings
TULSA CHESS ASSOCIATION
At Whiteside Recreation Center, 608
Wright Bldg., 41st and So. Pittsburg
Tulsa, Oklahoma: Tuesday evenings.
CHESSMEN OF MARPLE-NEWTOWN
8 PM Wed., at the old Broomall Library bldg., 2nd floor, Sproul and Springfield Roads, Broomall, Pennsylvania
FRANKLIN-MERCANTILE C. C.
Hotel Philadelphian, Broad and Vine
Streets, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Open daily.
GERA CHE8S CLUB
General Electric Company
3198 Chestnut St., Room 4443
Philadelphia, Penna. 19101
RHODE ISLAND ADULT CHESS CLUB
No. 111 Empire Street
Providence, Rhode Island

Continued from September issue

## Rating Classes

## Class A 1300 and up Class C 700 to 998 <br> Class B 1000 to 1298 Class D below 700

| Laturenson M R | 600 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Laturentus V | 1338 |
| Lavender J | 1222 |
| Lawler D P | 900 |
| Lawrence M J | 1348 |
| Lawrence R E | 760 |
| Litwson D B | 11.2 |
| Lawson F L | 6 S 8 |
| Lawton H M | 7116 |
| 1,iwton W W | 900 |
| Lay D | 1022 |
| Lay P | 1362 |
| Layton W G | 1124 |
| Leach J R | 769 |
| Le Bot J | 1232 |
| Lebowita A | 1032 |
| Lecker D | 1265 |
| Leclerc R | 1072 |
| Leder L | 1502 |
| Ledlie J O | 771 |
| Lee 1 R | 450 |
| Lee ${ }^{\text {F }}$ | 656 |
| Lee (; | 732 |
| Lee O A | 1022 |
| wee R H | 966 |
| Lee R J | 116. |
| Leedham C G | 996 |
| Leek Mrs M | 600 |
| Leek W R | 702 |
| Leeper R A | 1196 |
| Lees D M | 1560 |
| Leewright L | 738 |
| Leffew R | 900 |
| Legault O | 1096 |
| Lehman Mrs M | 692 |
| Lehpamer P | 1348 |
| Leibbrand $R$ | 716 |
| Leightman D | 600 |
| Leidner M1 | 1026 |
| Leinweber P S | 1734 |
| Leipsic R | 1300 |
| Leiserson A | 1300 |
| Leitel J H | 704 |
| Leiweke F J | 222 |
| Lemke J | 11.12 |
| Lenher Mrs S | 392 |
| Lemnig M | 780 |
| Lenoit C | 1350 |
| Lense E | 120.4 |
| Len\% C H | 996 |
| Len\% S | 1366 |
| Leon J J | 668 |
| Leonard A H | 1290 |
| Leonard B | 900 |
| Leonard $R$ | 600 |
| Leonard R R | 1144 |
| Leonard T | 600 |
| Leonard 'T F' | 1292 |
| Lerner S | 936 |
| Lertm R J | 594 |
| Leschensky W I | 850 |
| Leslie R C |  |
| Lesniewski J M | 92.4 |
| Less G H | 990 |
| Lesser C W | 588 |
| Lester O A | 1532 |
| Leufer A A | 127. |
| Levander R A | 1116 |
| Levin H | 1156 |
| Levine M s | 1236 |
| Levitt M | 986 |
| Levoy B M | 1078 |
| Levy G B | 75 S |
| Levy H M | 1266 |
| Levy L M | 600 |
| Levy S M | 1004 |
| lewhat I | 1412 |
| Lewis A | 961 |
| Lewis C V | 1018 |
| Lewis D | 484 |
| Lewis D D | 12010 |
| Lewis E H | 1010 |
| Lewis J B | 980 |
| Lewis L E | 800 |


| Lewis M | S1S | Lowenstein B E | 99 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lewis M E | 600 | Lowery T | 991 |
| Lewis R D | 1374 | Lown R K | S |
| Lewis \13 | 32.4 | Loy D | 12.56 |
| Ley F A | 1380 | Loyal M | 600 |
| Liban E | 1220 | Lucas J | 718 |
| Libke P A | 600 | Laseas T | 1178 |
| Licker ( | 1200 | Lukens D | 90 |
| Lidacis A | 1592 | Lukowski H J | 7515 |
| Lidral F W | 1034 | Luks P T | 121 |
| Lidstone $P$ A | 1250 | Lompkin A H | 1200 |
| Lieberman H | 1150 | Lund IV G | 700 |
| Lieberman L | 990 | Laindell L | (1) |
| Lielerman M | 1138 | lundh H | 1422 |
| Lifson R | 1150 | Lundstedt H 心 | 996 |
| Lightner A 12 | 398 | Lundstrom E | 1052 |
| Litien E | 900 | Lundy B P | 872 |
| Lilly \& B | 1414 | Lupinacei J | 55.1 |
| Lilly W M | 8.12 | Luprecht E | 890 |
| Limarzi .J | 1538 | Luprecht M | 68 |
| Limbeels D A | 690 | Lut\% M | 582 |
| Liming C | 91. | Lux J L |  |
| Lindbers D k | 612 | Lydy C M | 1 |
| Lindberg if H | 834 | Leynch F D | 1408 |
| Lindbloom E O | 540 | Lyneh J | 1 |
| Lindenhorg G C | 550 | Leneh J E: | 982 |
| Lindenfelser C | 584 | Lynch Jack | 1002 |
| Linder A | 1158 | Lyue G Mcl | 04 |
| Lingk C | 1112 | Lynn D | 1 |
| Lion C H | 990 | Lyon C | , |
| Li Petri $G$ | 1068 | Lyon R W | 04 |
| Li Petri N | 940 | Lyons 1. A | 100 |
| Lipson R J | 900 | Lyons T | $1)$ |
| Little C F | 634 | Lyrene 3 | 1300 |
| Little P H | 1262 | MacAdem M P | 600 |
| Littrell D A | 1324 | Maccarty S S | 1282 |
| Litwin D | 600 | MacConnell O M | 1518 |
| Litwin M M | 1436 | MacDermid E W | 152 |
| Litz G W | 900 | MacDuff R |  |
| Livingston D J | 860 | Macek ${ }^{\text {N }}$ L | 1025 |
| Livingston D | 1030 | MacFarland | 768 |
| Liso M F | 1256 | MacGowan T G | 909 |
| Lloyd S | 10.40 | MacGrady D |  |
| Loyd W E | 1014 | MacGrady J P | 1100 |
| Lobdell F K | 90 S | NacGresor G C | 1200 |
| Lockton R P | 950 | Mack A J | 1566 |
| Lodato I P | 468 | Mackay J I, | 9 co |
| Lodge G | 1300 | dackenzie C R |  |
| Lodge R | 900 | Mackenzic J T | 73. |
| Loeber W | 909 | Mackenzie R | 54 |
| Loeffler iV A | 926 | Mackes C a | 836 |
| Loew E | 600 | Mackin A C | 1114 |
| Logan J | 500 | MacLeod Mi W | 672 |
| Logan P | 518 | MacNeil J It | 1194 |
| Lohas Mrs ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 85.6 | Macormac H | 1336 |
| Lohrman R E | 129 S | Maddux O N | 1220 |
| Lombard N | 6.40 | Maddux P L | 521 |
| Lome J Fi | 822 | Maderer C | 1344 |
| London R | 1024 | Madison TH O | 1306 |
| Londry R M | 1080 | Maeda A | 866 |
| Longr G | 902 | Magnone F' | 1274 |
| Lons Glem: | 9.2 | Magura S | 1266 |
| Long J F | 808 | Mahdavi N A | 909 |
| Long W A | \$54 | Mahon R A | 1012 |
| Lonsenecker B M | 900 | Mahoney T E | 82s |
| Longstreth C R | 676 | Mahony D H | 1200 |
| Lonigan B | 764 | Mahrt IV F | 764 |
| Lonzi Y | 1004 | Maier E M | 1058 |
| 100 F K | 910 | Maillard B | 1466 |
| Loper G D | 1120 | Maille R J | 1214 |
| Loring R C | 1118 | Makajis A | 1386 |
| Losasso J C | 1152 | Maker P | 11142 |
| Lott C L | 1150 | Malagon F A | 1116 |
| Lott D | 718 | Malamud M | 900 |
| Louden W R | 1300 | Malkin M | 7 6 6 |
| Loughton K C | 778 | Malkin R E | 978 |
| Lovejoy F | 120.4 | Mallett J E | 754 |
| Lovely T A | 600 | Malone C D | 644 |
| Loven C A | (68. | Malone F F | 968 |
| Lown R K | 888 | Malone L C | 572 |
| Loy D | 1256 | Malsby J H | 660 |
| Low P | 518 | Mandel R | 760 |
| Lowden E G | 816 | Mang C | 1222 |
| Lowenstein $A$ | 666 | Mangels [ |  |

Mangold F W $7 \overline{5} 4$ Mankit $A \mathrm{H} \quad 1352$
 Nathos F
Mansfield $\& \quad \mathrm{~L} \quad 1106$ $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Mantell } O & \mathrm{~F} \\ \text { Napes } R\end{array}$ Napes $R$
Marakowski F J 900
Marasco , J 792
Mareh F C $\quad 942$
Mareotit F a 79 S
Marcts $\mathrm{B} \quad 836$
Mitrens 8 686

Marculis L, G 900
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Mariea J H } & 1306 \\ \text { Warkiewie\% W } & 1370\end{array}$
Markin P J 1020
Markley D ${ }^{\circ}$ A $\quad 680$
Natkowit\% \&
Darks A
Marks J
Marones is D 引01s
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { liarones D P } & 11: \% \\ \text { liamples H IS } & 110 \mathrm{~s}\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { harriolt if } & 900 \\ \text { hars } G & 600\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Marschall K } & 1290 \\ \text { Nirsh IV I: } & 1264\end{array}$
Narsh IV Is 1264
Marshall J A
Mirshall o D 600
Mirshall y
Manteney $W^{\prime}$ 'T 1200
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Nartin D } \\ \text { Nartin } & 1008 \\ \text { Warlin } & 1552\end{array}$

Mariin J A 980
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Martin J E } \\ \text { Martin } & \mathrm{J}, \mathrm{O} \\ 620\end{array}$
Martin J $\underset{~ S ~ 806}{ }$
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Martin J S } & 1400 \\ \text { Miartin Jos } & 165^{2}\end{array}$
Martin Los C
Martin 1, D 1372
Giartin $\Gamma$
Martin R
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Mlamin } & \mathrm{H} & 574 \\ 859\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Martin } S & 676 \\ \text { liarin } \\ \text { S }\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Nirlin WG } & 820 \\ \text { M:Mlin Wm G } & 900\end{array}$
Mistinez A 1012
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { Miulinez } & \text { A } & \text { T } & 1106 \\ \text { Martinez } & \text { C } & \text { D } & 120 t\end{array}$
DIrrtinez G E S 898
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Mantinson } G & 1214 \\ \text { Mason G }\end{array}$
Mirks A 900
Massitr R T 900
Massemgate 'T H 1056
Massie J A 998

$\begin{array}{llll}\text { Mastin O } & \mathrm{E} & 8 \overline{\mathrm{~S}} \\ \text { Masto } & \mathrm{J} & \mathrm{J} & 900\end{array}$
Matava F
Vate H
Viter
904
Matera $S$ S80
Mather $\dot{\mathrm{R}} \mathrm{H} \quad 1416$
Nathews N' $^{2} 1228$
Matoni R
Mattlaai H 1485
Natlhews $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{L}} \mathrm{L} 402$
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Matuhies A F } & 951 \\ \text { Matty H B } & 102 \mathrm{~S}\end{array}$
latzke o w 472
Maswell i $R \quad 698$
Minwell $D$
Haxwell I 718
Mrxwell ER R 9 пи
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Maty A C } & 1+4! \\ \text { May is A }\end{array}$
Maver $E$ 147

Mayer $G$
Mayer $J$
Mayer Mayer
Mayer
Mayes $R$ Maykowsk
Maynard
Mayo M
MeAllister iv G 97
McAteer
Mc
Mc
NicCall R
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { AleCann J J } & 9 \\ \text { MeCarson } & 124 \\ \text { MeCarthy } & & 118\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { McCarthy } & \text { J } & 116 \\ \text { McClellan } & \text { H } & 130\end{array}$
NecFoskey I W 1432
NeCloud W
MeClure
Meclure
MeConnell R $T$
MoCormack J D 50 MeCormick T $O$ 9a NeCoubrey
McCoubrey if 100 McCowan
NeCoy
MeCreight 1) 132 McCullough of 50
HeCome RE 117

 $\begin{array}{llll}\text { MeDonald } & \mathrm{T} & \mathrm{E} & 1112 \\ \text { MeDonall } & \mathrm{D} & \mathrm{K} & 10+0\end{array}$ MeDonough J 98 MeDoustall G A 10S8 AleDowell 13
McDowell C
McDowell
M
H7
MeEIros J 130
MeFarland
MeFarland $K ~$
1306 MeParland $W \mathrm{~T}$
MeGarry $T 03$ MeGavilt
McGehee W D 90
McGinty F A 75
Megowan
Megowan
McGowan J M 64
MeGrath W 130
NeGregor R F 16 L 0
McGuimess J T 1014
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { NeGuire } & \mathrm{D} & 64 \\ \text { NeGuire } & \mathrm{E} & 80 \\ \text { NeGuire } & \mathrm{G} & 76\end{array}$
McGuire S G
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { MeHale J } & 5 & 90 \\ \text { Neinnis J L }\end{array}$
Mcintyre
MeKay R F 120
Mckenna M C 74
$\begin{array}{llr}\text { Nokennal } \\ \text { NeKenzie } & 60 \\ 1182\end{array}$
Nekenzie I J 61
Mckibbin
Melaughin C 90
 McLreod D B
McMahon J J
$12!$
MeManus F W $\quad 95$
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { MeNally } & & 662 \\ \text { McNeely } & H_{~ a ~}^{2} & 901)\end{array}$
Mc Neese J M D 120
NicNemat J 3 $\begin{array}{lll}\text { MeNnits B } & \text { M } & 108 \\ \text { MeNnte } 5 & 105\end{array}$ MePherson D B 600 McPherson G C 99 Mceuarrie
Mewilliams
Meacham G R 70
Mease A N $\quad$ N $\quad 1310$ Nedve D C
Meeks
Merlis A 696
Meiden w 1392

| Meinwald Meister 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| , | 200 |
| Melis ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| Melze |  |
|  |  |
| Mendio |  |
| Menze |  |
| M |  |
| Mercl |  |
|  |  |
| erk |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| H |  |
| , |  |
| Metcalf C a |  |
| Netz H |  |
| Metz ${ }^{\text {cos }}$ |  |
| Mevzar |  |
| Metzier |  |
| orah |  |
| Mever E |  |
| yer |  |
| N |  |
| Meyer | (100 |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| haels. |  |
| Michnels H |  |
| Michats |  |
| Michael |  |
| Nickente |  |
| Middings |  |
| Middieton |  |
| Miehm |  |
|  |  |
| Nisic | an |
| Mik |  |
| 3 |  |
| viles |  |
|  |  |
| vir |  |
| 3 | 1296 |
| Willer is H |  |
| Miller |  |
| Miller |  |
| ler |  |
| ler |  |
| Miller |  |
| Miller |  |
| er |  |
| Miller Geo |  |
| , |  |
| ler |  |
| Miler ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| Miller it J |  |
| lier K |  |
| Mille |  |
| Minler |  |
| fer M |  |
| ler N |  |
|  |  |
| willer R |  |
| ler R |  |
| vililer |  |
|  |  |
| ler |  |
| Miller |  |
| lett |  |
| Millman ${ }^{\text {a }}$ A |  |
| s |  |
| tol |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| Miodus ${ }^{\text {IT }}$ D |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| Hicchell E M |  |



$\begin{array}{lr}\text { Pampel J L } & 982 \\ \text { Pangborn E } & 1046\end{array}$ Pantazi Papadeas W 782 Paplaskas $P$ C 105 Pappas C C 101 | Parent R J |
| :--- |
| Parenteats |
| 1300 | Parenteata $P$ A 1091

Parfitt A
Par $\begin{array}{llll}\text { Parbam } & F & & 1310 \\ \text { Piwham } & F & 73\end{array}$
Paris J
Pariseau $R \quad$ J 972

| Park A L | 734 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Park P F M | 976 |
| Parker F | 900 |


| Parker F M |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Parker i S | 900 |
| Pa |  |


| Parker L |  | 1148 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Parkerson | 1124 |  |
| 9.42 |  |  |

Parmelee R A 126

| Patulekas |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Piuley I | 6 |
| Pain |  |


| Paulowieh D G |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Paulsen J | W |
|  | 1068 |PaynePearlstein H $119 t$

Pearson L A 11582
Pease R A

| Peattie 1$) ~ J ~$ | 800 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Pear |  |
| Pat |  |
| 1200 |  |


| Peck C E | 936 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Peck L | $\mathbf{r}^{+}$ |


| Peckel A |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Peden D | 125 L |

Pederson H
Peebles H
Peeler W E 8

| Pehas A | 1296 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Pehnec $T$ | 1636 |


| Peisach T | 1552 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Pemstein R | 1198 |Pence R


| Permman J | 92 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Perlman S | 60 |
| Perlmuter D | 90 |


| Perry C K | 90 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Perry G A | 130 |

## Perry $R$

## Perry w

## Perry W

Peskowitz $P \quad 60$
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Peters } \mathrm{C} & \mathrm{H} & 90 \\ \text { Peters } & \mathrm{F} & \mathrm{F}\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Petersen } & \text { L } & \text { I } \\ \text { Petersen } & \text { R } & 936 \\ \text { Peterson } & \mathrm{B} & \mathrm{J} \\ \text { Per } & 896\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllr}\text { Peterson } & \text { B } & \text { J } & 896 \\ \text { Peterson } & \text { E } & \text { H } & 1316\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Peterson } G & G & 87 \\ \text { Peterson } J & G & 10 \mathrm{ls}\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Peterson } & \mathrm{L} & \mathrm{S} \\ \text { Peterson } & 910 \\ \text { Peterson } & 135\end{array}$
Peterson R E
Petersons R

| Petit G | 878 | Prochera | 00 | Rhodes R |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Petras D M | 990 | Proudfoot C B | 900 | Ribner M P E | 00 |
| Petrison $\dagger$ | 1402 | Pruitt $A$ | 806 | Ribowsky M | 1288 |
| Pettis L | 950 | Pruitt R A | 590 | Ricciardi A R | 60 |
| Pelty M | 600 | Pruss S M | 594 | Rice HG | 1032 |
| Pieifer V | 810 | Pugh J L | 900 | Rice L E | 850 |
| Pflumm E A | 1560 | Pulienski F | 900 | Rich A D | 1430 |
| Phagan R J | 1080 | Futlen B R | 632 | Richard A | 61. |
| Phares 0 | 900 | Purdy K | 818 | Richards | 7 |
| Phelps C | 90 s | Pura R | 904 | Richards J | 85 |
| Philipp W | 768 | Pye F W | 1042 | Richards K |  |
| Philips E J | 900 | Pyle F T | 756 | RichardsonA IV | 101. |
| Phillips 0 C | 878 | Pyle J B | 912 | Richardson H |  |
| Phillips 8 k | 958 | Quane D | 950 | Richardson J |  |
| Phipps o A | 730 | Quartueci P | 1200 | Richardson N |  |
| Phythyon J | 1426 | Quazza R | 910 | Richardson S G | 900 |
| Piazza J R | 1200 | Queen D | 4.48 | Richter R J. | 1072 |
| Piche N | 1028 | Quindry A IE | 1312 | Richter s | 40 |
| Pickard A M | 1092 | Quinlan $G$ | 988 | Rickless D | 11 |
| Pickering | 992 | Quiring D | 912 | Ridule J A | 94 |
| Pierce D M | 570 | Raasoch J | 956 | Hider J E | 101 |
| Pierce I S | 1128 | Rabinowitz S | 968 | Riegel P S |  |
| Pierce N S | 900 | Rabinowitz $V$ | 814 | Rieger T |  |
| Pierne R A | 760 | Racette G W | 1338 | Riegler R M | 112 |
| Pierson G E. | 1270 | Rachlin W. S | 1084 | Riesembeek | 51 |
| Prggins | 682 | Radeliffe V | 866 | Riili $B$ | 90 |
| Pilkington W | 900 | Radebaugh J | G 600 | Riley ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 1290 |
| Piltz J | 568 | Rader R .t | 991 | Riley ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 95 |
| Pincumbe J L | 320 | Radthe H J | 8.42 | kinde O | 120 |
| Pinson D H | 1278 | Radziemski L | 600 | Rinella M |  |
| Piper A | 1266 | Raepple E W | 714 | Ringham if | 900 |
| Pipher J | 1272 | Raff L M | 1272 | Riopelle 10 |  |
| Piracei | 9.40 | Raffin $T$ | 472 | Rios J | 900 |
| Pittenger w v | 1534 | Ragan P C | 900 | Rist J | 1398 |
| Pitman R W | 814 | Ragsdale I \& | 109.1 | Ritner P $\mathrm{V}^{\text {c }}$ | bou |
| Pizzo J | 1164 | Ragsdale T | 706 | kitner s |  |
| Placek w | 916 | Rahey R D | 1132 | Rivas M A | 112 |
| Plant w | 676 | Railey I | 1092 | Rivera $D$ | 16. |
| Plattner J L | 900 | Raines L P | 988 | 12izzo H |  |
| Plemel 13 | 1108 | Rains S R | 1286 | Robbins E F | 5 |
| Plever H | 910 | Rairdin $G$ | 600 | Roberson C 1 | 32 |
| Ploss H | 1474 | Ramer P A | 808 | Ropertie ix a | 1 |
| Plover $f$ P | 938 | Rammelkamp | C 1336 | Rolerts D |  |
| Plueinski C E | 1074 | Ramthun w | 648 | Roberts F' A | 97 |
| Plummer * A | 664 | Rand H | 854 | Roverts J k | 98 |
| Plumnier R L | 976 | Randlett H A | 976 | Roberts Is | 130 |
| Piutzik A I? | 1200 | Rankin $J$ G | 1102 | Roberts L | 1646 |
| Pogolotif S H | 904 | Rapier J R | 754 | Koberts L W | 97 |
| Pohl H | 1200 | Rash J L | 336 | Roberts R | 120 |
| Pohl H | 1002 | Rash T | 858 | Koberts $T$ | 92 |
| Fohle R E | 1522 | Rashower C | 6001 | Rolserts ${ }^{\text {P }}$ | 63 |
| Poilion A | 458 | Rasmussen $G$ | 51018 | Roberts Tom | 6i0 |
| Polgar E | 1478 | Rasmussen W | IV 938 | Roberison C H | 3 |
| Poliakoff 1 | 1450 | Rathmamz D |  | Roliertson fi H | 1132 |
| Polillo A | 1198 | Rateliff S | 609 | Kolnertson |  |
| Pollack \$ | 1018 | Rathvon J | 7 T | Robinson A A | a |
| Pollier C | 724 | Rathvon N F* | 1074 | Robinson is d |  |
| Pollock E E | 968 | Ratiiff D | 680 | Robinson G T | 1288 |
| Pollworth L R | 680 | Ratliff $G$ | 1300 | Robinson I C | 1184 |
| Pomilio A | 548 | Rattler | 1252 | Robinson J M | 128 |
| Pompeit F T | 600 | Rauch H S | 127.1 | Robinson Jos | 95 |
| Pond L | 868 | Rausch C J | 878 | Robinson L | 94 |
| Poole E O | 886 | Raver R , | 730 | Robinson ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ | 92 |
| Poole F' | 70.4 | Rawlins F C | 940 | Lobison H H. |  |
| Popel S A | 1400 | Rayden $J$ | 1080 | Roby D L | 1178 |
| Popick P | 1038 | Raynor D | 1200 | Roche F |  |
| Popkin J D | 668 | Rea W H | 300 | Roche T J | 97 |
| Popp S R | 842 | Realbuto J | 1085 | Rochet A |  |
| Porco J | 668 | Reamer D | 1380 | Rock H E | 1002 |
| Poriss E | 878 | Rebane M | 680 | Rockmore XI | 1162 |
| Porter W | 1538 | Reddoch E | 990 | Rockwell E |  |
| Porter W B | 103.1 | Reddy D L | 1014 | Rockwell J | 1208 |
| Portin P J | 1300 | Redman T | 906 | Rodeschin J |  |
| Posner D | 1324 | Redmond Fo | 1212 | Rodigere $]$ iv |  |
| Post A | 952 | Reed D | 960 | Rodier $G$ |  |
| Post A P | 106. | Reed T $\mathbf{L}$ | 1302 | Rogers D D | 1292 |
| Post L A | 1158 | Reeder G W | 1056 | Rogers F J |  |
| Potorsky R | 1200 | Reedy C | 900 | Rogers J H | 900 |
| Potter C w | 430 | Repmeyer J | 900 | Rogers L R |  |
| Potter R B | 1652 | Reese J | 1136 | kogers W I | 1130 |
| Potter W W | 900 | Reruss W C | 1200 | Rogers W P |  |
| Poulette R | 1952 | Regan ${ }^{\mathrm{H}}$ | 1184 | Rogstad X | 398 |
| Powell C D | 1316 | Regan P A | 800 | Rohright iv 1 | 込 |
| Powers E B | 600 | Reich T | 908 | Roine I) IG |  |
| Powers J F | 970 | Reichard 11 | 659 | Rollins I E |  |
| Powers R R | 1094 | Reichard J M | 846 | Rollins K H |  |
| Pransky K | 820 | Reichel W | 1006 | Rollins R L |  |
| Pransky Kermit | 1356 | Reichman j | 127.4 | Romatnenko | 1498 |
| Prather F 1 | 137 G | Reid C P | 725 | Romanowsky |  |
| Pratt D A | 600 | Reid J | 649 | Romero A |  |
| Pratt F W | 760 |  | 900 | Ronan H R | 1376 |
| Pratt W C | 116. | Reilly M T | 1350 | Ronning G | 147ij |
| Prattes $\mathbf{P}$ | 1065 | Rein $J$ W | 900 | Rootare K I . | 1230 |
| Prazak G | 1220 | Reinboldi J | 1434 | Rooza L A | 1290 |
| Preisman M | 1506 | Reinersman $J$ | 580 | Roscoe A J |  |
| Prescott P ${ }^{\text {P }}$ | 600 | Reinsch B | 1230 | Pose D E | Si |
| Presley R R | 906 | Reis R | 1220 | Rose E | 20 |
| Pressey B | 1200 | Reilz O H | 900 | Rose H | 1182 |
| Price D M | 1302 | Reitz L, R | 900 | Roseman A |  |
| Price K | 132 S | Remer B R | 1164 | Rosen P | 97 |
| Price M | 1018 | Remick ${ }^{\text {H M }}$ | 122. | Rosen R | 1078 |
| Price R A | \$34 | Remile $S$ | 600 | Rosen Rob | 104 |
| Price W W | 278 | Keno J | 600 | Rosenberg ${ }^{\text {P }}$ | 90 |
| Priddy J L | 700 | Resnick H L | 900 | Rosenber H |  |
| Priebe S G | 136.4 | Resnick ME | 1018 | Rosenber IS |  |
| Primack J E | 906 | Restle P | 1152 | Rosenberg S |  |
| Prim C E | 864 | Renterdahl T | 1300 | Rosenherger |  |
| Primerose W | 901 | Reynolds D R | 1538 | Rosenfeld J |  |
| Prince A E | 940 | Reynolds K L | 558 | Rosenshine A | - 900 |
| Pritchard A | 1200 | Reynolds L E | 1248 | Rosenthal $T$ |  |
| Pritchard E W | 906 | Rhode H J | 10.0 | Rosenwald L J | 1258 |
| Pritchard L E | 9.48 | Rhodes B | 900 | $\xrightarrow[\text { Rosenwald }]{\text { Rosenzweig }} \mathrm{HL}$ |  |

Rosin $\mathrm{R} \quad 000$
Siun

| Roskind D | 1442 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Ross C B | 1362 |
| Ross C F | 87 S |
| Ross D A | 900 |


| Saurs 4 | 1200 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Sarar J | 1528 |
| Sarfi ${ }^{\text {dr }}$ | 344 |
| Sass J | 1200 |
| Sasscer R R R | 532 |
| Sattinser G | 536 |
| Saudek G | 900 |
| Samer R P | 782 |
| Saunders D I, | 5 F 6 |
| Sautiol A | 758 |
| saumer H | 900 |
| Satuvageat $\Gamma$ | 1302 |
| Savage J | 1030 |
| Savage B E | 900 |
| Savary $G^{\text {a }}$ | 301 |
| Sawyer $S$ | 1086 |
| Sayre R S | 948 |
| Scarpinato A | H 904 |
| Schati W H | 720 |
| Sclamefer D | 1280 |
| Schaefer E | 688 |
| Schaeflier O A | 1242 |
| Schafer F L | 900 |
| Schaffel I M | S54 |
| Schaffer M M | 1338 |
| Schapira M | 1298 |
| Schaye \% | 900 |
| Schechter $\times$ | 1310 |
| Schecter I | 962 |
| Scheffer 10 Mi | 1570 |
| Schellman G W | -1534 |

Scroggins H D 1008 $\begin{array}{lr}\text { Serrrgs D J } & 1252 \\ \text { Scully J J } & 958 \\ \text { Seares R A } & 900 \\ \text { Sarrs H } & 1352 \\ \text { Sears R } & 628 \\ \text { Seastrum O F } & 698 \\ \text { Secord D F } & 1058\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Secord } P_{R} \\ \text { Seedorf } & 105 \\ \text { S }\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Seery A J } & 90 \\ \text { Sergal L } \\ \text { Self }\end{array}$ Self $A R$
Selmanorf J
124 $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Seltzer H } & 1200 \\ \text { Seney J C } & 1480\end{array}$ Senter $F$
Sequeira Severance H 1 , Severance
Severn A
Seversom IR $\mathrm{S} \quad 114$ Seymour Shader
Shaetfer
Shafer
Shater
Shaff J
Shate ${ }^{3}$ A
Shatfer Shaffer T
Shafran
S.
Shake $G$ i
Shamel
Shandor Shandor Shammon R L 123 Sha

| 958 |
| :--- |
| 9009 |

## 28

90

## 48

 480900 900
895 854
1148 1148
6040
 $\begin{array}{llll}\text { Rourke H J } & 590 & \begin{array}{l}\text { Schaffel Matfer M M } \\ \text { Rowan G C }\end{array} & 81338 \\ \text { Row } & & \text { Schapira MI } & 1298\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Rowand } T & 502 \\ \text { Rowe 1Y } I & \$ 42\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lrr}\text { Rowland H } & 900 \\ \text { Ros D } & 126 \mathrm{~S} \\ \text { Royalty } & \text { D } & 600\end{array}$


Sc
Sc
S
S
S
$\begin{array}{llr}\text { Scheper J } & & 976 \\ \text { Scheper J J } & 1020\end{array}$

| Scheper | F |
| :--- | :--- |
| Scheper | 1354 |
| Scherer | 880 |

Scherer S A 1302
Scheryep E C 1154
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Schevrer WH } & 10 \pi 4 \\ \text { Schick of } & 89 \\ \text { Sohterling } & 1128\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lr}\text { Schimel W } & 1168 \\ \text { Schlecker i } \\ \text { Sos }\end{array}$ Schleicher E A 1350
Schleidt R E
St $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Schleidt } R & E \\ S 20 \\ \text { Schlesinger P } & 1.978\end{array}$ Sehlief 1 F
Schliesing
Schlisser

RuI
Rus
Sch
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Sharbell } \mathrm{H}^{*} & 66 \\ \text { Shatluck } & 140\end{array}$
Shatituck ${ }^{5} \mathrm{~F}$
Shats
Shatw
Shas
Shestn
$\begin{array}{lr}\text { Shear C ( } & 180 \mathrm{~S} \\ \text { Shearman L S } & 600\end{array}$ Shedd $D$
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Shedenhelm R W } & \text { j200 } \\ \text { Sheelan T E } & 600\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lll}\text { Sheets } \mathbb{R} & \mathrm{F} & 90 \\ \text { Sheerz } \mathrm{F} & \mathrm{F} & 74\end{array}$
Sheetz
Sheh
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Sheldon M } \\ \text { Shelles H } & 1154\end{array}$
Shelley H L $\quad 1372$
Shelley R
Shelton
Shepard
Shepard
Shepherd J H. ISS
Sherar $C$
900
588
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { Sherman } & \text { D } \\ \text { Sherman } & \text { M } & 85 \\ \text { Sh } \\ \text { Shert }\end{array}$
Sherr P
Sherwood C
161
131
Sherwood R A 102 Shew D
Shifty IV L $\quad 90$
Shine Js
Siningledecker H 30
Shinsato $\mathrm{F}^{\mathrm{F}}$
Shipley
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Shivery } G & 81 \\ \text { Shives } A C & 80\end{array}$
Sholmatt S
Shook
Shook D
Shooter
Shortz R E S 8 S 86
Showna
Shreve D R $\quad 1100$
Shutord D B $\quad 141$
Shulman $S$
Shultis $R ~$
$R$
Shupe $D R^{10}$
Siadak J W J J
$\begin{array}{lr}\text { Sidrys I } & 126 \\ \text { Sienel J J } & 60\end{array}$
Siegel Joan $\quad 9011$
Siegel M
Sierel Marvin 1380 Sigerson if $f$ Sig] J R
Simer H
siklos A
Silberber
Silikowets A
Silliman J
Silverman S

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Stockwell Stohlman <br> 812 968 | $\underset{\substack{\text { a } \\ 1026 \\ 1026}}{ }$ |  |  |
| ， | Sorenson TR |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | ， |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sootes 6 | Stonkus， 1 |  |  |  |
| ， |  |  |  |  |  |
| 101 |  |  |  |  | Von saleski |
| ＋199 |  |  |  | 500 |  |
| 1200 |  | ${ }_{1}^{132}$ |  |  |  |
|  | H10 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | （334 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ${ }^{1037} 117$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\underset{\substack{\text { Spiparek } \\ \text { Spors }}}{\text { a }}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sloane E $13{ }^{132}$ |  |  | Thomas E E C ${ }^{\text {Themas }}$ |  |  |
| somow |  |  |  |  | Walker ${ }^{\text {Wan }}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Statemmp DK |  |  | der |  |
|  | 1100 |  |  |  | Wallace ${ }^{\text {W }}$ D ${ }^{\text {W }}$ |
| E | 近 |  |  |  | Wallace ${ }^{\text {Wen }}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| in Don c ${ }^{\text {in }}$ |  | Suisussar $\mathrm{V}{ }^{1224}$ |  |  |  |
|  | ${ }^{1317}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 15，1114． | Stis |  |  |  |  |
| 153， |  |  |  |  |  |
| 号 H |  |  |  |  |  |
| h3 ${ }^{119}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Steekoll |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Yanginderen ${ }^{\text {J }}$ ， 924 |  |
| Smin or m | Sternim Mrs Litad |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Yan Kinich E 1154 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \％30） |  |  |  |  |
|  | Stein We |  |  |  | War |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 边 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Vegauli fa ${ }^{\text {Veb }}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {coid }}$ | 132 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Yer |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | sievens ${ }^{\text {dem }}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Stevens R．T，${ }^{1012}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Stevenson ${ }^{\text {S }}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | （tarsmen |  |  |  |
|  | 1210 |  | ${ }_{\text {Tremerser }}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |



| Yanis C | 734 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Yanis M | 1108 |
| Yarmak S | 1542 |
| Sarmus J | 1328 |
| Sbarrondo 1) | A 950 |
| Seakel 1 | 64.1 |
| Yee J | 1360 |
| Yee Jos | 1536 |
| Yee V , J | 820 |
| Yehl J N | 1340 |
| Yeller M Fi | 600 |
| Yerhoff F J | 1608 |
| Yevuta J | 976 |
| Ylanko E | 810 |
| Yochem R R | 574 |
| York L | 590 |
| Youmans © P | 13.40 |
| Young C S | 64) |
| Young $\mathrm{D}^{*} \mathrm{~A}$ | 1218 |
| Soung J | 520 |
| Young M | 900 |
| Young P R | 600 |
| Young R C | 83 |
| Young W E | 864 |
| Young Wes E | 1002 |
| Young Wm E | 738 |
| Younghusband | B 530 |
| Youngquist 0 | 1160 |
| Yvole M | 600 |
| Zacks N | 920 |



Ratings as of June 30, 1965

## POSTAL MORTEMS

Game Reports Received during August 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 pleces 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 belorr, 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) given in text below the key.

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

## CLASS TOURNAMENTS

Four-man Tourneys Graded by Classes

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

Notice: Game reports on all tourneys begun in October 1963 become past-due this month. Get in reports to reach us here by October 30 to avoid losing on double-forfeit (both players lose!).
Tourneys 1-404: 236 Lohrman. Wa!lach tie. 260 Hudgins bests Bancroft. 276 Austin tops Dovydaitis. 333 Steger lops (2a) Lohrman.

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

Tourneys 1-199: 20 Vlahos wins from Giesen, 22 Nystrom nips Parmett 37 Bendix and Bass each top Diamond iwice: Bass bests Carlson twice. 47 Smith smites Duncombe. 83 Nelson. Fats beat Baxter, \$8 Gray conks Coppess, 105 Bartle withdrawn, 109 Duke downs Hendricks. 135 Fredericks withdraws, loses (a) to Michaels. 136 Ebis conks King twice. 140 De Lozier, Giesen tie twice. 142 Greene. Best each top West twice. 143 Karan whips Westbrook. 151 Slomowit\% mauls Glassmire. 15: Lecker licks Wallach. 158 Reinboldt downs Dulicai. 163 Pratt conks Kessler. 169 liell jolts Jirousek, $1 \$ 1$ Moyer, Vanginderen spllt two. 182 Bancorft tops (f) Rosen. 188 Lamasney best Bushaw.
Tourneys 200, 299: 203 Pittman wins from Smith. 206 Monath loses to Cohen and ties

Wigger, 249 Price axes Aumper, 214 Van Lith bows to Sprague but bests Chick. 216 Faires fells Frand. 220 Compton loses two to Roberts. one to $\mathrm{O}^{+}$Neil; Roberts rips O'Neil: Gordon withdrawn, loses (2a) to Koberts, 227 Kinslow, Nelson tie. y2G Beam. Scott tie. $2 \boldsymbol{y}$ ( Eyman tops Hickman twice. 24 De Souza rips Reichman. 246 Rains routs Aks, 248 Thiberutit tells Fuchs. 252 sava's, Welling tie. 255 Rains rips Cross. 250 Kuturo eonks Hempel, 262 Laker bests Cattwright: Merkin wilhdrawn, 263 Cronenberg licks Lfttle. 26t Kiesling withdrawn. 268 Bell withdraws. 269 Aks, Hellehert tie. 273 Lifson licks Peacock. 277 Peacock, Westbrook tie. 278 Goodall downs Gosswiller, 280 Fattman, Snsder iie. 283 Poillon tops Middux twice. 287 Faus conks Cooley. 288 Weber whips Keeney, 290 Williams fells Formani. 245 Younghusband halts Thomas and Constantine
Tourneys 300-359: 310 O Neil tops CiarLatietlo and Lops and ties De Lozier, 312 Scherrer rips Tileston, 318 Berry bows to Pomilio hut bests Ellers. 316 Railey rips Board. 319 Eridges, Steffee tie. 322 Kook eonks Atehley and Gran. 326 Strong tops Coggin (2f) and Plover (a). 332 Kyreakakis Lops (2a) Howell. 334 Bass bests King. 33s Rickless licks Lloyd. 340 McCloskey clouts Tanath. 344 Greene tops Glass iwice 345 Bergquist beats Agnew; Buck withdrawn. $3+6$ Stuber bows to Himes but bests Witleisa: MeNut withdrawn, $3 / 7$ Thomas loses to Pouletce but tops (20) Labie: Capritta conks LaBre. 352 Huckin halts Frithiot. 3 Bin Thomats loses to Lane but ties Walmisley, 354 Wunderty licks Pettis twice. 355 Miller socks Silliman. 357 batra bests Vest. 35s Faves. Reis split two. 359 Hepner tops Hoeft twice.
Tourneys 350 - $416: 360$ Burroughs wins from Hurns. 362 Benjamin tiess and loses to Keith and loses (2a) to Boss. 363 Aparicio tops Taylor. 365 Trone trips Smith and (a) Henderson. 367 Sachs nips Neill and Hogan. 373 Powers tops Stentz twice, 379 Velt tops Stentz lwice: Aparicio stops Stentz and Seit whe etach, 381 Youmans conks Lee dud Kontris. 385 Ethame halts Haitsch. 389 Fawbush fells Hartwick. 390 'Trachtenberg' tops burgess twice. 399 Varren whips Lewis; Warren, Lewis lop Anderson twice each. 100 Kiesenbeck rips Goodin. 103 Harris loses to Lowery but splits two with Neufeld. 401 Fay fells Millar, 405 Scheper withdrawn. 407 Grossman njps Noreen: Piracci conks Kaiser twice, $f 09$ Neville nips Hof'mann Isice 411 Bram beats Sehultz. 412 Betger. Carrigan split two 416 Martin loses two to Schliesing, withdraws and drops (a) to Prazak.

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

Tourneys 1-59: 4 Binncrofl beats Arms. Noble nips Lindberg. 6 Gosswillev licks Lewis. 19 Fountain fells Angstenherger, 11 Lewis tops Grossman twice. 15 Mitchell manls Oatis. 18 Kohn. Martin tie 19 Beam, Schechter tie, 21 Griffin matuls Miller twice. 22 Grossman halts Hollis twice; Harvison clowns Dickerson. 24 Dickerson lops Litz twice tund Grossman once. 25 Connet conks Smith 27 HickKenzie beals Ballew; Wagner bests Ballew twice and McNeely once, 30 Bancroit tops MeNulty and (2f) Denniston. 3 I Massengale matils Siadak. 33 Reichard licks Lux and splits two with Fillis. 12 Romanowsky withdrawn. 19 Hogan. Gayton split two. 51 Chosak lops (2f) Samdak, 5ik beedhann rips Rolbinson. 56 Plant clips Clark,
Tourneys 60-99; 60 Farms ties and lops Berger-Olsen, 67 Farrison licks Frallen but loses to Jarvis. 68 Martin tops Foldsworth Lwtee and Gurgess once. 71 Matonii withdrawn. 73 Kis conks Blochinger. 75 Severance licks Ledlie. 77 Kieslich conks Blochinger. TS Quane quells Domanico. s: Clayton clouts Bell. S3 Ybarrondo tops Seedorf twice. St ballenger heats Bicksler: Olesen withdrawn. 85 Case conks Palmedo and Poole; Faber withdrawn. 89 Clausing withdraws. drops (a) to Bender, 91 Laney licks Kaweske, 92 Williams whips Margulis. 95 Siadak lrows to Nielsen but beats Ellis. 96 Roberts tops (2r) Steck. 97 Carpenter fells Follets.

Tourneys 100-149: 101 Gerzadowicz ties and loses to Mahon and loses to MeCoubrey. 10.t Reichard tops (2f) Vogel. 105 Tuttle tops Monaco and loses to and ties Keith. 108 Brown withtoawn. Ling Murphy matts Erdtmant. 112 Daniels withdrawo. 115 Slomowit\% sligs Yanalavage. 121 Michaels downs Dehman: Feterstein withdraws and drops (a) to Delman and (2a) to Michaels. 122 Chosak, Morgan split two. 126 Siadak. Viets tie. 127 Gavallatro conks Sharpe. 129 Steinberg conks Connolly. 130 Nilsson nips Gillis. 132 Grimm tops Carter and ties Palmedo; Carter withdraws, drops (a) to Grimm. 134 Aks replaces Burgstahier. 136 MacDuff withdrawn; Moody tops Brockman and ( 2 a) MacDuff 137 Hair tops Taylor. 140 Litule rephaces Jever. 1.41 Hiller bests Bixby twice and Martin once. $14 \overline{5}$ Dolter and Olsen both top MacGregor twice.
Tourneys 150-285: 151 Sakarias licks Iewis. 152 La Flam stops Stein. 153 Blumetti, Garber best Sipples: Faires fells Carber: 155 Mierzejewski mauls Masto. 158 Boyle withdrawn, 161 Ewen loses all games. 169 Simon socks Whaten, 171 Baldwin bests Quane, 172 Troew licks O'Connor; Ruska withdraws. 175 Strong bests Bobiner. 182 Kyker withdrawn, loses (a) to Wood. 194 Pipher fells Moisey, 197 Gayton replaces O'Hagan, 199 Showalter withdrawn, loses (a) to Lindberg, 208 Long tops Teubner. 209 Reruss rips DePaul. 225 Bridyes rips Reichman esk Rundett replaces Prattle, 253 Goering replaces Tutlle. 69 Canfield replaces Wons.

## PRIZE TOURNAMENTS

## Seven-man Tourneys for Premiums

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

Notice: Game reports on all toumeys begun in October 1963 become past-due this month. Get in reports to reach us here by October 30. to ivoid losins on double-forfell (both players lose!).

Wimers now set up by the closing of the Angust 1963 tournevs appear in Postal. mighties? in this issue.
Tourneys 1-112: 106 Werner mips Vergara.

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

Tourneys 1-89: 3 Hall. Sheetz tie. 29 Doyle. Tainer tie. 31 Gauson hips Nowak. 35 Cartier toses to Moon but licks Marschall. 43 Bartlett bests Schmidt. it Met\% beats Seybold. 47 Chenoweth conks Cook. Is Roby rips Scott; Gould, Moks tie. 50 Jurado jars Robinson. 52 Mftekin matuls Doren; Plemel clouts Clark, 53 Bruce bests Halliwell and Bubb. 61 Cuschleg licks Plemel; Cody, Cuschleg down Buckendorf. 62 smith tops Broyles but bows (f) to Hoglund. 68 Smith smites Malkin. 69 Pond withdraws. 72 Leach spills Spohr: Hyde nips North. 73 Rosenberg jolts Taylor and Joseph. 75 Webber whips Jones. 76 Klein. Aks tie Ault: Boroviak, Winans Lie. 77 Goldbers bests Cohen; Rollins fells Fuchs. so Goldwasser, Pehas iie. \$2 Tomko tops Heirrich. 83 Hamilton smites Smart. 85 Chism chops Raasoch; Chism, Tingle Jar Jessett. $\$ 7$ Pond withdraws. 88 Wells hips Hitdenbrand and Arnow. 89 Dickey downs Sarti.
Tourneys 90-120: 91 Frank tops Thomas, 92 Herndon, Sorenson down Thompson; Sorenson socks Shandor. 03 Helper rips Robinson: Kirchik tops Zetollo and (a) Asselta. if Totte bests Bowman, 95 Ekstrom, Nestrer Lie, 9 G Leitel ties Stark and loses to Clark: Ehrman lies Charles and loses to Stark. 97 Mangold bests Orbanowski. 100 Bolden ties Carlyle and tops Neff; Robinson withdrawn, loses (a) to Cotter and to Bolden. 101 Homan rips Rogers. 103 Netherton, Eves and Kegan halt Hess; Kegan conks Eves. 105 Agnew nips Laurenson: Aparicio tops (f) MeCloud. 107 Friedman ties Twaiten and Schevrer 109 Correction: Weeks won from Welch. 111 Booth bests Kline and Yanis. 112 Mintz mauls Brenesal., 113 Dyba ties Bettini and Blochinger, 115 Soforic socks Mullison, 116 Filipelli, Stohlman best Barker. 118 sylvester licks Lindenberg. 120

Rosenwald, Rathvon rip Schliesing: Rathvon routs Rosenwald.

## Starłed in 1965 (Key: 65-P)

Tourneys 1-29: 1 Wendling wins from Loudry. 2 Conner, Greer conk Viet; Greer tops Conmer and (a) Canton. I Schmidt ties Ward and tops Post. 5 Farber fells Jamison. 6 Longenecker elips Clark. 7 Dyba, Schmiat down Pohl; Kohn conks Carr, 9 Horrill matuls McHate. 10 Mott-Smith smites Morris, Hynes and (a) Siadick: Klacsmann elips Hynes, 12 Ellis rips Robinson. 13 Parks downs Peden: Wright withdrawn, loses (a) to Osborne. 14 Herrick tops (a) likin; Benham bests Thoms. 16 Latus beats Belt; McLaughlin licks Hall and Kirchik. 19 Lodato mauls McCormack, 21 Lieberman licks Buhalo. 23 Page halts Haines; Endsley licks Price: Hartenstein withdrawn. 24 Gervais withdrawn; Moody mauls Presley. 25 Gieselman stops Hartenstein; Anderson downs Spohr. 26 Meglis tops (f) Haltisan, 27 Woelfinger, Burton down Siadak. 2s Matty tops (i) Newman; Twaiten tops Reeriy and ties Steckoll. 29 Matty mauls Komor.
Tourneys 30-75: 32 Freedman downs Prince and Gordon: Hall hails Gordon. 33 Nester nips Frank. 34 Leach jars Joseph. 36 Nowak whips Frank. 37 Duncan downs Stephens. 39 Sumser lies Pratt and tops Hartensiein. 42 Nester nips Nowisk, 43 Rosenshine rips Warren: Martinez withdrawn. 45 Soforic socks Criner. 49 Rumley widhdraws. 50 Bolden bests Hynes, $\bar{l}$ Lovejoy jolts Carr.

## GOLDEN KNIGHTS

Progressive Qualification Championships

## 12th Annual Championship-1958 <br> FIRST PLACE PLAYOFF (Key: 58.Np) Section 1 Pehnee withdraws.

## 13th Annual Championship-1959

## FINALS (Key: 59-Nf)

Sections 1-32: 28 Schoene, Westing tie. 32 Crenshaw, Calingaert and Turbin rout Braun; Reed rips Turbin.

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

Sections 1.32; 27 Mataya tops Blat. 28 Harvey rips Rudolph. 29 Falk Lies Fleming but loses to Woodworth and Remick; Remick rips Self; MeCarson withdrawn. 31 Ashley, Blakemore tie.

## 15th Annual Championship-1961 <br> SEMI-FINALS (Key; 61-Ns)

Sections 1.95: 75 Connor, Johnson lie, 83 Doro downs Jones. S5 Gonzalez drubs Eldredge. 86 Fuchanan, Bowen tie. 87 Pateman bows to Hilman but besis Bellamy. 90 McGunnigle nips Prattes, 92 Meshi mauls McKaig. 93 Jones withdrawn. 34 Hikdreth tops Beck and Taylor.

## FINALS (Key: 'bl-Nf)

Sections 1-32: 9 wallace wins from Keady. 12 Travis trips Graetz; Fontenrose fells Shultis. 15 Sullinger socks Gauson. 18 Tutthe tops Cheswick. 20 Hardman spills Spit\%; Bard, Kneeream tie. 21 Nusser nips Kiff, 23. Fox fells Thomas; Russanow rips McKaig. 25 Mueller mauls Wisegarver, 28 Glassberg bests Churchill, 29 Coveyou conks Ward; St. Martin tjes Mayer and tops Ward.

## 16th Annual Championship-1963 <br> PRELIMINARY ROUND (Key: 63-N)

Sections 1-177: 9 Lastinger withdrawn. 159 Freelander fells Faust and Grabiel. 160 Dunkle downs Clements. 175 Menzies bests lsartlet.

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

Sections 1-59: + Sloane halts Hamilton. 13 Moore fars Johnson, 18 Lay licks Bigler, 23 Jataski jolts Browne. 24 Robinson, Thompson tie. 26 Muller whips Wending; 2s Slade
bests Beckham; Thompson tops Moore 29 Brand, Lach and Aks spill Sparkman. 35 Ballard bests Woodward. 37 Donins tops (i) Holes: Abramson withdratws, 38 Walloch. Smidehens top (a) Kawas, to Deines, Worrell tie: Bielefeld bests Hayes: Faivus, Soules tie. 42 Ozols lieks Rohy but loses to Hildreth. 45 Stevens stops Stark, 46 Gorman licks Ashley, 47 Johnson ties Dibert and also Schleicher. is Schuette downs Dalrymple. 19 Wood whips Schliesing. 50 Rundlet rips Stamper. 52 Birsten bests 1Andstrom. 53 Fish downs O'Donnell; Christman matlls Freeman. 56 Crenshaw downs Gordon. 57 Dunkle socks Sidrys. 58 Wasiliew whips Stephan: Ferdinand, Hyde tie. 59 Yerhoff conks Edsecombe: Matagon withdrawn.
Sections 60-66: 61 Clark clips Pendleton. 62 Johnson rips Rattler: Weihe whips Malkin.

## FINALS (Key; 63-Nf)

Sections 1-13: 3 Sokoler socks Lyneh; Bland conks Kent. \& Bahr beats May and Burdick. $\bar{j}$ Bender ties Jessen and Cotter: Jessen tops Julson and Perea. 6 Nusser hips Fornstein and Steputat; Hornstein stops Bostwick. 7 Martin licks Lane; Dulicai ties Lane and tops von Hagel. \& Patterson tops MeGettigan.

## 17th Annual Championship-1964

## PRELIMINARY ROUND (Key: 64-N)

Sections 1-119: 47 London downs Eatman. B4 Marica mauls Voker. G1 Howell hajts Roberts. 62 Wojtowicz whips Berger-Olsen. 65 Ashley, Blanz and Westbrook mob Moncharsh. 76 Lliso. Stabler tie. $\$ 3$ Coveyou conks Brison, 84 Burton, Lee and Goff beat Scott. 85 Breider bests Bernero. 90 Cannon thes Henderson and tops Crow. Larzelere conks Costigan. 92 DiJoseph Jolts Jamison, Itkin and Cavinaugh, 100 Rabinowitz rips Singer, 102 Malkin. Mooney tie, 14 Goff nips Burk and Harnack; Berger-Olsen loses to Goff and ties Harnack, 15 Pohle bests Beesley. 107 Bragg mauls Friedman. 108 Oswald bows to De Leve but bests Bruce. 109 Magnone loses to Stern but licks Crum. 110 Pehnec nips Stuchell. 111 Franke socks Samuel; Matthews mauls Franke and (f) Samuel. 112 Bischoff bests Rundlett: Roth rips Wright. 113 Wisegarver ties Levander and tops Bullockus. 114 Opp, Steele tie. 115 Loy licks Esposito: Gilliland drubs Hendricks. 116 Tingle ties Webb and tops Schuller; Webb whips London. 117 Greeaberg bests Berthoud and Derr but bows to Tremblay and Lohrman, 119 Davidson downs Johnson.
Sections 120-151: 120 Marshall ties Taylor but bows to Robinson; Vandemark tops Taylor. 121 Whitman ties Grayson and Gibbs and tops Walmisley. 123 Warner whips Tachdjian. 125 Christman whips Webb: Bell withdraws, loses (a) to Camplell and Weihe. 126 Dallas withdrawn. 127 Carson. Lachs conk Arthur; Carson tops (a) Callaghan. 128 Meyer bests Weinherg: Cayford. Kaplan jar Jessen. 129 Terry tops Hamilton. 130 Connell nips Gionfriddo: Brandreth jolts Jeans. 131 Wolters withdrawn. 132 Stark stops Stephens. 135 Miller licks Bourgeois but loses to Randlett. 136 Casper downs Dollard, Bramante and Howard. 137 Klein. Ozols tie; Smithers beats Bier, 143 Weinkaul withdrawn, loses (a) to D'Atri. 145 Koehler bests Burley and Gist. 14S Adorjant jars Hartwick; Crum downs Dawnkaski. 149 Roskind routs Crabtree, Lown and (a) Hansen; McGuinuess licks Lown: Von Saleski mauls Hansen and MeGuinness. 150 Howes, Morrill win from Pompeii: Crowder withdraws.

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

Sections 1-19: 1 Wolf loses to Anderson but licks Mezey; Sulligan whips Browne and Wolf. 2 Littrell mauls Abrams and Muir. 3 Kehler beats Buhalo. 5 Hubbard, Neff tie: Hoglund loses to Neff but tops (f) Kramer 6 Lidral. Wright tie: Van de Carr ties Caroe and Wright. 7 Donins downs Lynch. 9 Maillard drubs Stayart and Dreibergs: Stern stops Goff; Dreibergs bests Nusser and Stern. 12 Weininger whips Del-
man; Daly, Tabler tie: Miller mauls Rufer and Ozols. 13 Monson bests Booth, it Milas nips Knobel. 17 Gottesman rips Rugs, is Baron beats shreve and sidrys; Aranofli ties sidrys and loses to Frank. i9 Suyker loses to Lane hut licks Mason; Faivus fells Lane.
Sections 20-38: 21 kwartler stops Steel. 22 Smith. Tener tie; Bloom conks King. 23 O'Neil nips Miller: ltkin withdrawh. \& Levy. Makatis conk Karli, 25 Leinweber, Butand lick Custer: Birsten hests Buthand. 2s Cayford fells Herrick and Prazak.

## 18th Annual Championship-1965 <br> PRELIMINARY ROUND (Key: 65-N)

 Sections 1-29: 1 Vittes bests McKaig but hows to Staufler: Carter withdrawn. 3 Witson tops Tileston; Carpenter. Healy tie. A Trimingham loses to Wilson but licks Loo: Wilson whips Loo. 6 Spangler spills MeFarland and Gamblin. \& bolkes downs Doren. 9) Frederick loses to Cody and withdraws. 10 Woelfinger ties Anderson and tops King. 11 Blakeslee, Koehter down Donaldson: Koehler conks Blakeslee. 12 White. Tomko top Green. 13 Goodale licks Ash but loses to Lunch: Ash axes Leibbrand. 15 Crenshaw jars damison. 16 Stark stops Hendry: Parker conks Stark and Corrigan. 18 Parham mauls Menzel; Ilyin axes Frierson and Parham. 30 Youngquist ties Pitman but loses to Berger Olsen. 22 James jolis Samn, Niylor and Meisger; Kaezmarek nips Sann and Naylor; Naylor nicks Samm, 23 Cuschteg licks Rugs. 25 Coverdale downs Sidrys. 27 Meyers withdrawn. 28 Ferdinand licks Lidral. 29 Landey fells Fish; Varles licks Loetfler.Sections 30-59: 30 Hamilton. Sauvageath the. 31 Gratto tops Biker and (a) Lukens and ties Johnson. 33 Klein tops (f) Field, 31 Moore mauls Horne; Polgar fells Faivus: Joyner jolts Castello. 36 Addleston tops Boss and Frank. 37 Martinez, Beach hest Potofsky: Whiteside nips Neal. 38 Gancher halts Zonies and Herdt: Sobieraj nips Neal. 41 Melton conks Kent; Thompson withdrawn. 42 Brown bests Berthoud. 43 Noyer mauls Muir: Neumann whips Meinwald. At Angers rips Gehringer; de Sherbinin licks Lafemina but loses to Frank. sa Keyes bow to Mckaig but bests Mixson. 46 Dulicai loses to Tutle but licks Kleman. is Gallagher axes Endsley. 49 Dinesco downs Belt: Beninsoso, Bram tie. 50 Parkinson tops (f) Dunkteherg. 91 Kelly conks Chase. $\overline{2} 2$ Mason matals Bratten; Gilbert bests Warren. 53 Vamamoto lies Vaughan and tops Carpenter: Sibbett bests Buchanan. 34 Moj er nips O'Neil. 55 Brown beats Barasch: Norris nips Powell. 56 Giem sock Sigi. $\overline{\text { in }}$ Wojtowic\% bows to Bruce but bests Wennerstrom. 59 Norin nips Wennerstrom and Phythyon.
Sections 60-79: 60 Sildmets wins from Hansen: Yeller, Hansen best Bernero. 51 Bachman, Gottesman Jar Jamison: Bowers fells Dickey and Fogg. 62 Casey loses to Stern but licks Shortz. 63 Ashley, Willis tie. 65 Smithers smites Brown, 66 Hendrick drubs Ferret, 67 Howell bests Ball and Roberts. 69 Valvo halts Blametti athl Fiumphreys. 70 Reepmeyer rips Mandel. it Miller withdrawn: Carpenter tops Ratisch and (a) Miller, 72 Rabinowitz bests Prince but bows to Mantell; Mantell tops Moyer. 73 Entwistle matuls Mantell; Good, Sholman lick LeClerc. 74 Von Hagel halts Groner. 75 Graham downs Deiden 76 Paulekas ties Page but loses to MacNeil. $7 T$ Abrams: Ward tie. 78 Klein clouts Blochinger and Winston: Winston conks Kolts, 79 Fuchs fells Hall: Rosenherg. Piazza rip Goodman: Finley and Sims withdrawn; Rosenherg tops (a) Finley,

Sections 80-99: 80 Daniels wins from Strahan: Malone tops (a) Bankhead. S1 Butland bests Stulken. 82 Finley withdrawn. 83 Angstenberger tops Jeans and (f) Savage: Vaitkus jars Jones. 84 Kaman, Ozols conk Cook; Brown licks Pitulekas. 85 Ashley halts Hoasland. 86 Smith smites Comer, 87 Charney nips Sparrow; Dreibergs, Sparrow rip Ward. 88 Ifothman routs Cook and Salvitti. 91 Ingalls loses to Carpenter and withdraws. 92 Narkinsky nips Penniston; Aptt downs

Dickey: Carrigan conks Hawksley. 93 Markiewicz socks Siadak, 94 Sanders tops (f) Tertel. 95 Gilbert bests Jamison: Cavamaugh withdraws 9f Bland whips Oswald. 97 Carpeliter tops (i) Berres: Zoller withtrawn. 9s Reduary hests Macek.
Sections 100-155: 100 Jacobs bows to spence and look but bests Jamison. 102 Tarbell whips Wiermm, 103 Cos beats Goldbers but hows to Robertie. 104 Martin licks Westbrook hut loses to Grafa. 105 Patteson, Massengale top (a) Wathen, 106 Hendel downs Carney. Int Klawitter, Welling rip Richardson. Ios Cayford conks Prazak. 111 Van Brunt tops Mantell. 112 Foslien fells Follett. 114 Lawrence licks Gassen and Fasolino: Gassen, Smich (ie, 115 Hamilton beats Terry but bow's to Robertie. 120 Nielsen nips Peterson and Holmes, 15 Moore mauts MeKennal. 127 Ashley licks Weinschenk, 129 Collens conks Ball. 13. Autt maths Mekthhin. 138 Angers replaces Pratte. 139 Hachatek replaces Rumohr.

## new postalites

The following new Postal Chess players begin in Augusi with these ratings:
CLASS A at 1300: C G Blom. \& $T$ Coleridge. L A Libreros, R J Merrill, I S Middleman, G $W$ Nelson, $L$, A Nelson, $G$ Schwart. $V$ Shiples, $N$ vian Deusen and $w$ Verbias; CLASS B at 1200: G W Berg. E A Bryan, C Cortese, M Gabriel. J Hernandea. W I Kirsch, B Kuiken, J E Messina, H Simpson. G W 'Tessaro, I Weisinger, L P Weiss, s. Weyl and $B$ Young;

CLASS C at 900: J Adams, G Har'sdori, R I Remis, R B Colson, J Conley, P Crane, L Curran, I Cvejanovich, \& Danforth, R U Dever. S England, $K$ Enston. L Fagnoni. W Ferner. H Greco, E Glick. P Grick. Rila Golf. L, Gatston. J D Harris, T C Howard, Is Johnson, D Klein, 1 Leistman. B Lijpfert. E. Lupienski. ( Martin, H Michaels. T i Muir. V' D Oehrlein, O E Ortega, W Paterson. \& Pohl. T D Reagor, T Roberts, \& schmeider. K shmm, o al smith, iv w Turner, i Weinbere, R E Willitums, I, J Wojnowski, A F Wright and V I Voder: CLASS D at 600: J Burriss. M C Clanton, L E Dillier, D Davott. W N Dustin. H M Gokin. L George, E Getek, Rachel Goodmon, G I Gordon, J Gowin. R Hembles, If MeGrath, Mrs if B Moore. S Olsen, Is L'alombo. if $M$ Pope. A Radar. if E Ross, Mis: J A Rowehl, J Satitatins, C A seammon. Fo Shirles and P Kaas.

## RETURN POSTS

The following old timers returned during August at these former ratings:
\& Nevard s2e: H if Russell 754; F: $F$ schacfer lles and L S Shearman 770.

"Get some sleep, Roger. Tomorrow you can start facing the fact you're just a

## CHESS BY MAIL

If you have not played in our tourneys before, please specify in which class you would like to start. We recommend Class A for unusually strong players, Class B for above average players, Class
C for about average players and Class D for below average. If you have played, please state your probable rating.

Mail proper entry coupon below, or copy of it, to CHESS REVIEW, 134 West 72d Street, New York, N. Y. 10023.

## CLASS TOURNAMENT

Start playing chess by mail NOW! Enter one of the 4 man groups.

You will be assigned to a section with 3 other players about equal to yourself in playing skill. You play both White and Black against the other three. You play all six games simultaneously, two games on one set of postcards.

Your game results will be recorded and published in CHESS REVIEW as well as 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.

I CHESS REVIEW $\square$ Check if a new 134 W. 72d St., New York, N. Y. 10023
1 enclose $\qquad$ Enter my name in Postal Che (how many?) sections of your Postal Chess CLASS Tournaments. The $\$ 1.50$ per section. Kindly start/continue (strike out one) me in Class.

## NAME

ADDRESS
CITY ......................... STATE

## PRIZE TOURNAMENT

Start playing chess by mail NOW: Enter one of the 7 man groups.
You will be assigned to a section with six other players about equal to yourself 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 awarded to 1st 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.


# TOURNAMENT NOTES Progress Reports for Golden Knights Tournaments 

## 13th Annual Championship

In the 1959 Golden Knights. Finals section 59.Nf 28 has completed play, and the contestants therein score the following. weighted-point totals:*

R C J Somerville 39.6; E R Westing 35.8; F Schoene 30.75; R K Hart 27.3; P B Tomaino 26.3; H Druker 19.45; and P L Stark withdrew.

We still have a number of Finals to hear from: but melding those listed above into the previous standings, we have the following, prospective. cashprize winners:

|  | PRESENT | LEADERS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Berliner . . . . 46.2 | E E Hansen |
|  | Steinmeyer ..46.2 | E R Westing ..35.8 |
|  | B Ilderton ..44.0 | L R Klar |
|  | Schuler ....44.0 | L Dreibergs ...35.6 |
|  | Siklos . . . . . . 43.95 | G J Ferber ....35.6 |
|  | Doumanoff ..43.95 | J F Shaw .....35.6 |
|  | Fidlow ......43. | F Ashley |
|  | Sherr . . . . . . 43.45 | J E Kilmer . . . 35.1 |
|  | A Popel .....43.0 | J Feldman .....35.0 |
|  | J Kneeream . 42.0 | $L$ M Raf |
| B | Crowder . . . . 41.7 | R R Coveyou . . 34.45 |
| R | Verber . . . . . 41.7 | B Wisegarver . 34.45 |
|  | Meyer . ...... 11.2 | J Rist $\ldots, \ldots, \ldots 34.1$ |
|  | V Kildea | G Wood . .......34.1 |
|  | C Gross . . . . 40 | W Bland |
|  | S Johnson | M Sokoler |
|  | D Dulical ...39.6 | I Romanenko |
| D | Howard . . . . 39.6 | L A Walker ...33.35 |
| R | Somerville ...39,6 | R L Anderson ..33.0 |
|  | W Herrick ...38.55 | J Dragonetti ...33.0 |
|  | E Goddard ...3s. 5 | L Johnson .....33.0 |
|  | B Sachs .....38.5 | Mrs G Hornstein. 32.9 |
| A | Lidacis .....38.35 | L J Roza ......32.85 |
|  | D Patten . ...38.35 | E Polgar |
|  | Watterson ...38.35 | D H Miles . . . . 32.75 |
|  | \$ Zitzman ..38.35 | S St Martin ...32.t |
|  | Vittes ......337,55 | s Simcoe ...... 32. |
|  | L Eastman . . 37.45 | G Borowiecki |
|  | Healy ......37.3 | G L Munson . . 32.25 |
|  | Johnston ....37.3 | R B Fischer ...31.76 |
|  | A Veguillo ... 37.25 | C G Gibbs ....31.7 |
|  | Blankstein ...36.9 | S Mont .......31.7 |
|  | G Priebe . . . 36.9 | 1 Zalys .......31.7 |
|  | B Joyner ....36.7 | H M Avram ...31.6 |
|  | L Dayton ...36.25 | R K Hart ...31. |
|  | A Curdo .....36.2 | R T Shultis . 31. |
| , | E Edbers ...36.1 | F Smidchens ... 30. |
|  | A Crowle | 31.3 |

## 14th Annual Championship

In the 1960 Golden Knights, no new Finals section has completed play during August.

## 15th Annual Championship

In the 1961 Golden Knights, no new Finals section has completed play. J S Hiltman, however, has qualified for assignment to the Finals.

## 16th Annual Championship

In the 1963 Golden Knights, three more contestants have qualified for assignment to the Finals: E Sloane. D Ballard and O G Birsten.

Also, D Freelander and B Menzies have qualified for the Semi-finals.

## 17th Annual Championship

In the 1964 Golden Knights, five contestants have qualified for assignment to the Finals: J G Sullivan, D A Lit-

[^4]trell, L Dreibergs, M Gottesman and S Baron.

Also, the following have qualified for the Semi-finals: R London, J H Marica. W D Howell, E M Westbrook, E J Blanz, E P Stabler, A Goff, R S Cannon. R Larzelere, J M DiJoseph, D L Oswald, T Pehnec, R Franke, F B Mathews, L C Steele, J L Tingle, G Tremblay, F E Vandemark, J C Robinson, C F Whitman, E J Werner, J F Campbell, J Christman, J W Weihe, K R Carson, Mrs E Terry. G F - Connell, J C Miller, D Carper, L F Peck, W Koehler, B F Brod. ersen and D Roskind.

## 18th Annual Championship

In the 1965 Golden Knights, these contestants have qualified for assignment to the Semi-finals: L Vittes, L Spangler, T Folkes, L Parker, F Parham, J A Ilyin, M Berger-Olsen, F Ferninand, B M Landey, A Addleston, $R$ Melton, V Neumann, W A Parkinson, D J Sibbett, R Moyer, J H Norris, W A Norin, E Bowers, F B Casey, W Howell, J Piazza, H Rosenberg. J F Shaw, Vine Smith and W Markiewicz.

With the tournament to close for e!tries November 30 , we have competing as of August 31 all of 155 sections, i.e. with 7 in a section, 1085 contenders.

## POSTALMIGHTIES!

 Prize TournamentsThese Postalites have won prizes in the 1963 and 1964 Prize Toumaments.

| Tourney |  | Players | Place | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 63-1 | 63 | M Centa | 1-2 | $5-1$ |
|  |  | J R Spohr | 1-2 | $5-1$ |
|  | 70 | . N Cotter | . 2-3 | 4-2 |
|  |  | C Hiber | 2-3 | 1-2 |
|  | 72 | $\mathrm{F}^{\text {F }}$ G Martin | 2-3 | 12-12 |
|  |  | R Strauss | 2-3 | 31-21 |
| 6.t-P | 18 | Doris If Gould | 2nd | $4-2$ |
|  | 62 | F. W Hoglund | 2-3 | 42-12 |
|  |  | . L Wojtowiez | $2 \cdot 3$ | $42 \cdot 1 \frac{1}{2}$ |
|  | 64 | Helene Carpenter | 1-2 | 5-1 |
|  |  | R J Webber | 1-2 | 5 - 1 |
|  | s2 | J W Tomko | 1st | 6 -11 |
|  | 113 | . D Netherton | Ist | (6-1) |
|  | 112 | N Mintz | 181 | $6-11$ |
|  |  | $G$ A Bouvier | 2nd | 5 -1 |

## Class Tournaments

These fostalities have won or tied for first in the 1963. 1964 and 1965 Class Tournaments.

| Tourney | Players | Place | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 63-C $\begin{array}{r}2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2\end{array}$ | $\leqslant$ Magura | 1si |  |
|  | J A Byrd | 1-2 | 4-2 |
|  | L. J Ponovan | .1-2 | 4-2 |
|  | R P Lockton | 1-2 | $4-2$ |
|  | IF J Voker | 1-2 | $4-2$ |
|  | M Weil | .1st | 32-23 |
|  | F S Knatier | . 1st | $5-1$ |
|  | I H Mirkil | 1-2 | 1 -2 |
|  | M Smith | 1-2 | $1-2$ |
|  | R E Lohrman | .1st | 52-2 |
|  | P M Brown | .1st | 4-2 |
|  | R G Caster | 1-2 | 3-3 |
|  | R Frand | 1-2 | $3-3$ |
|  | J B Germain | 181 | 32-21 |
|  | H Seroggins | .1st | 3-3 |
| CH-C | K D Bass | .1st | $6-0$ |
|  | C J Duncombe | .1-2 | 5-1 |
|  | J Smith | 1-2 | $5-1$ |
|  | R C N'elson |  | 5-1 |
|  | D Lecker | 1-2 | 5-1 |
|  | L C Martin | .1-2 | 5 - 1 |
|  | J J Vanginderen | .1st | $5-1$ |
|  | M Bohnen | .1st | 6 -0 |
|  | ${ }^{J} \mathrm{P}$ Ellis | 1-3 | $1-2$ |
|  | H H Faires | 1-3 | 4-2 |
|  | R Frand | 1-3 | 4-2 |

227 F L Nelson ..... 1st 12-1


## TIME COMPLAINTS

We apologize for continued delay on time complaints. Not all but a number of the affictions of Job kept the Postal Chess Editor from the job for stretches in July and August. He hatd time only to clear such work as let the CEEESS REVIEW clear for press. His correspondence bogged down.

By the time you read this, all July and August time complaints are disposed liy:

A Those properly drawn up per Rule 13: activated (first week in September) if only because they contained records we needed to return to complaintants. Well try to wrestle out solutions to the over-long delays as defendants answer;
$B$ Those sent merely as Rule 14 reports (without official data required by Rule 13): discarded as impractical for investigation after such lapse of time. You can act now by sendins repeat to opponent and, if such fails to evoke reply within 10 days, stating so along with statement of dates of your orisinal move, original report to us and your repeat;

C Where evidence justified: opponent forfeited (e.g. if more than one Postalite reported and at least wo instances were drastic). These, like any other forfeits. are subject to reconsideration if proper evidence proves delay was excusable, so we trust no hamm will remain on too sthmmary a forfeit.

D Complaints sent Aug. 25 to Sept. 6: discarded per statement (top of page 252. August issute) in reference to vacation time out.

## FAIR WARNING!

Apply for Class and Prize Tourneys NOW -next month. entry fees go up-next edition of Golden Knights likewise. We will accept 1965 Golden Knights entries at old rates, also entries to Class and Prize for assigrment in October or as soon after as we can fill assignments.

"But. Jeffrey, I don't want to learn to play chess. Bill taught Marian, and look what happened to their marriage!"

## POSTAL GAMES

from CHESS REVIEW tourneys

## Annotated by JOHN W. COLLINS

## Boomerang

Black neatly repels White's unripened attack.

## TWO KNIGHTS DEFENSE

## R. Cherry

M. Frithiof

1 P-K4 P-K4 3 B-B4 N-B3
2 N-KB3 N-QB3 $4 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$
To achieve more than equality, White must choose a different move: e.g. 4 $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} .4 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ or $4 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$.

## N×P!

A similar center-destroying "sacrifice" is seen in the Vienna Game. It equalizes without risk.

## $5 \mathrm{BxP} \dagger$

Or 5 NxN, P-Q4.

| $5 . \ldots$ | $K \times B$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| 6 N $\times \mathrm{N}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q4}$ |



7 N/3-N5 $\dagger$
White is out to get his Queen in, but the move is quite dubious $7 \mathrm{~N} / 4-\mathrm{N} 5$ t. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 18 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ is better as $8 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3$ 9 N-R3, BxN ought not alarm White.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 7 \ldots \\
& 8 \text { Q-B3 }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 1
$$

....
White is committed as his Knights hang.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
8 \ldots \mathrm{~K} & \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2 \\
9 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5
\end{array}
$$

9 , . . QxN loses to $10 \mathrm{QxP} \dagger$ etc.
10 Q-N3
N-N5
11 K-Q1
....
Now White strands his King to save a Pawn. $110-0$ is better with such threats as $12 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ and 13 NxQP : and 12 P-B3 to open the Bishop file.

## 11.... <br> P-KR3

Now White's Knights are repelled.

| $12 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q5}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $13 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q6}$ |
| 14 PxP | BXN |

Black's objective is to mobilize his Queen Rook quickly.

```
15 QxB
1 6 ~ N - B 4
PxP
R-K1
```

The threat is 17 . . Q-K7 $\dagger$ is NxQ. $\mathrm{PxN}_{+}+$with mate to follow.

```
17 Q-B5
P-KN4
18 Q-N4
```

There's no other way to save the Knight: 18 NxP, Q-K7 mate or 18 Q-N6т, B-N2 etc.


Black's attack is dark for White.

| $18 \ldots$ N-K | Q-B4 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 19 | Q×P |
| 20 | Q-K4 |

White actually threatens mate. True, he loses a piece, but nothing really matters now. $20 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ loses to . . . N-B7.
$20 \ldots$ Q-K7† $22 \mathrm{KXP} \quad \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{N} \dot{\mathrm{K}}$ $21 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q} \quad \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Q}_{\dagger} \quad 23 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3 \mathrm{C}$.

Though 'tis true: "No one ever won by resigning," one can save postage.

| 23 R-QN1 | $\begin{array}{c}\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B7} \\ \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} \dagger \dagger\end{array} \quad 25 \begin{array}{l}\text { K-N4 } \\ \text { Resigns }\end{array}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4 \dagger$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

On 26 KxNP , Black can mate in various ways: e.g. $26 \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3 \div 27 \mathrm{KxP}$. B-K6s $28 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 4, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 3$.

## Prefabricated Attack

Black has a built-in, book-given attack for the middle game in what he describes as his "best correspondence offort to date."

## RUY LOPEZ

Dr. Bruce Pullen
Frederick Jarvis White

Black

| 1 | P-K4 | P-K4 | 4 | B-R4 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 2 N-KB3 | N-QB3 | 5 O-O | N-B3 |  |
| 3 B-N5 | P-QR3 | 6 R-K1 | $\ldots .$. |  |

Against the Worrall Attack, 6 Q-K2, sometimes called the English Variation. Black can play the Tartakover Counter Attack, a version of the coming Marshall Counter Attack, with 6 . . . P-QN4 7 $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 3, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} 8 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$.

| 6. | P-QN4 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 7 B-N3 | $0-0$ |
| 8 | P-B3 |

Barden advises $8 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$. On 8 P-KR3. Black has 8 . . . B-N2! or 8 P-Q4. P-Q3!

| $8 \ldots \ldots$ | $P-Q 4$ | $10 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| $9 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $11 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ |
|  |  | $12 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\ldots$. |

The text is standard. Fischer's original idea is 12 P-N3 denying Black's Queen access to KR5. Many strongly favor 12 BxN .

| $12 .$. B-Q3 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 13 R-Ki | Q-R5 |
| 14 P-N3 | $\cdots$ |

Not 14 P-KR3 because of 14 . . BxP!
$14 \ldots$ Q-R6
15 B-K3!

15 . . . P-KR4!? (Boleslavsky-Saigin, Minsk 1961).

## 16 Q-Q3

QR-K1
Theoreticians have in general switched from 16 . . . P-KB4 to the text.

$$
\begin{array}{lc}
17 \text { N-Q2 } & \text { R-K3! } \\
18 \mathrm{BxN} & \ldots . .
\end{array}
$$

Here 18 P-R4! P-KB4 19 Q-BI, Q-R1 20 P-KBt is considered best. But the text is probably satisfactory. See comment at end of game.

| 18 P-R4 | P×B |
| :--- | ---: |
| 19 | P-B4 |
| 20 Q-B1 | $\ldots$. |

Boleslavsky has analyzed a draw by perpetual: $20 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4$. KR-K1 21 PxP . BxP! 22 PxB, RxB 23 RxR, RxR $24 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 1$. PxP $25 \mathrm{QxP}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 6 \div 26 \mathrm{PxR} . \mathrm{QxP} \div$ etc. 20

Q-R4
Black still has an attack, though diminished, after 20 . . . P-B5 21 QxQ. BxQ 22 BxP. RxRt 23 RxR, BxB.

| 21 P-KB4 | PxP |
| :--- | ---: |
| 22 R×P | B-KR6 |



23 QxP
The decisive mistake. The Queen is needed on the Kingside: 23 Q-B2, 23 Q-B3, 23 Q-K2 or 23 Q-Q3 is better.

## 23

R/1-K1
24 . . . RxB and 24 . . . BxP are threats.

## 24 N-B1

Mate follows 24 Q-Q3. BxP: 25 PxB , Q-N5 $\ddagger$.

$$
24 \ldots \quad B \times P!
$$

The thematic "sacrifice" in this line here threatens 25 . , . RxQ and 25 $\mathrm{BxB} \uparrow$ among other things.

## 25 Q-N7

25 Q-Q3 loses to various moves: simplest is $25 \ldots \mathrm{BxN}$,

```
25... .
Q-B6!
```


## Resigns

Only the problem move, 26 QxP , pre. vents mate on the move.

If White is to go into this whole controversial variation, seen more and more these last three years, he must try such improvements as $18 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Rt}$ or 18 Q-B1 and 23 Q-B3. Additional information on this line may be found on page 89, March issue, O'Donnell-Chace.

## PERSONAL SERVICE

The Editor of this department, a former Marshall Chess Club. New York State and U. S. Correspondence Champlon, and Co-reviser of Modern Chess Openings, 9th ed. will play you a correspondence game and give critlcal comments on every move for a $\$ 16.00$ fee. Write to John W. Collins, 521 East 14 Street, New York, N. Y. 10009.

# THE KING'S INDIAN DEFENSE - The Classical Variation 

$\mathrm{C}^{\text {HOICE of opening, in a large measure, is a matter of fashion. When }}$ a given variation is handled successfully, even just once, the fact often has consequences, similar to a chain re-action. Adepts may follow the example and theoreticians set to examining the subject carefully. Then suddenly, practice and theory stop. The variation remains hanging in the air, with no definite judgment possible. The positions have become too complicated, the possibilities too numerous; and examples from practice on which to rely desist.

Such was the fate of the Taimanov Variation of the King's Indian which was played regularly five to ten years ago, with variable success. Black obtained some fine victories on the Kingside, but so did White on the Queenside. It might be expected that just this ambivalence would encourage enterprising players to adopt the variation. But it did not.

White can be blamed, and yet with some sympathy. It must be understood that White expects to be the aggressor. Hence, he dislikes being on the defensive on the Kingside and so avoids the normal deployment with $6 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$. On the other hand, Black, if he suspects he may be encountering a rehabilitated line, can avoid it, and even sooner, by 3 ... P-Q4, switching to the Gruenfeld Indian.

Now it seems of a sudden that the variation will be set in motion once again. Larsen broke the silence and played it in his first match game with Tahl. He won so convincingly that Tahl lost his predilection for the King's Indian and deviated into the Gruenfeld thereafter.

Consequently, it seems useful to look for the threads left hanging five years ago, defining and evaluating the problems put at that time. This must be, however, but a survey as the field is very extensive.

White


Black
P-Q3
P-K4
$\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$
$\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 2$

$9 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 1$ is the usual continuation, But it is not certain White has nothing better. He has, in fact, a tremendous choice: e.g. $9 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 2,9 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2,9 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 1,9$

B-N5, 9 P-KR4, 9 P-QN4 and 9 P-B5. The last two are the best and perhaps offer possibilities of an advantage in the opening. As there are dark spots in the existing theory, these two will be surveyed briefly before the main line.

## Side Variation I. 9 P-QN4

Sub-variation $A$

$$
9 \ldots \quad \text { P-QR4 }
$$

This is the obwious rejoinder, White has two principal responses.

Sub-sub-variant 1
10 PxP
$R \times P$
Pemrose's 10 . . . P-Bt merits study. $11 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$

B-R3!
The only way to avoid disadvantage according to Mueller.

12 N-N3
BxB
Elimination of the Queen Bishop decreases the danger of White's Queenside attack.

| $13 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 7$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| $14 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R}$ |
| $15 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3$ |

With equal chances.
Sub-sub-variant 2
(From first diagram plus 9 P-QN4, P-QR4)

| 10 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | 14 | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N}$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 11 | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | 15 | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| 12 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4$ | $16 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 6$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| 13 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KN} 5$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $17 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |

Van Scheltinga-Euwe, Beverwijk 1958. $18 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 5$
White seems to have good prospects.
Sub-variation B
(From first diagram plus 9 P-QN4)

| 9 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 4$ | 12 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 10 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3$ |  |  |  |
| 11 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KN} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4$ | $13 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 6$ | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N}$ |
|  | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | $14 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |  |

White has the lead (Taimanov-Gligorich. Santa Fe 1960).

## Side Variation II.

(From first diagram)
9 P-B5
The most consistent continuation.
Sub-variation A

| 9 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| :---: | ---: | ---: |
| 10 PxP | PxP |  |
| 11 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR4}$ |  |

White is threatening $12 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QN} 5$ and, if 12 . . Q-N3, then $13 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$. He has a very good game (Korchnoy-Fischer, Curacao 1962).

Sub-variation B
(From first diagram plus 9 P.B5)


Sub-sub-variant 1

| $10 \ldots \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{BP}$ | $\mathrm{KN} \times \mathrm{QP}$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| 11 | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{N}$ |

On 11 ... NxN, white has 12 NxQ, $\mathrm{NaQ} 13 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4 \div \mathrm{etc}$.
$12 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{N}$
White is certainly not badly off.


Position after 10 NXP

Sub-sub-variant 2
(From above diagram)
10
....
NXKP
11 NxNP
Now, on 11 . . NxQN $12 \mathrm{NxN} \div, \mathrm{QxN}$ 13 PxN, BxP $14 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 1$, White has compensation for his Pawn.

On 11 . . RPxN 12 NxN, NxP 13 NxP, the chances are equal.

Anything is possible, however, after 11 . . . BxN 12 NxR, B-N2 13 NxP, KxN $14 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 415 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5 \dagger, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 116 \mathrm{BxN}$, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} 17 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5$.

## The Main Line

(From first diagram)
$9 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 1$
N-Q2
The text best promotes Black's strategical objectives: preparing $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4$ and stopping $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB5}$.


Key Position

## Sub-variation $A$

$10 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$
This is the oldest continuation but not the best. It gives Black ample opporIunity to realize his King-side attack.
$\begin{array}{lllll}10 \ldots & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4 & 12 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KN} 4\end{array}$
11 P-B3 P-B5 $13 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 3$
Now, on 13 . . . R-B3? $14 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 3$, Black's attempt is too sharp: 15 PxP, PxP 16 N-N5, N-B1 17 B-K1, P-R3 18 $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{R} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 419 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 220 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$, and White's Queen-side attack is more powerful than Black's on the opposite flank.

But, with 13 . . N-KB3 14 P-B5. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 315 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2 \quad 16 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 117$ PxP, PxP 18 Q Q2, P-N5 19 KR-B1, P-N6: Najdorf (Black) scored a fine victory over Taimanov (Zurich 1953).

Sub-variation $B$
(From the Key position)
$10 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q}_{3}$
P-KB4
$\bar{\dagger}=$ check $; \ddagger=$ dbl. check; $!=$ dis. ch.


Sub-sub-variant 1
11 P-B4
This Pawn sacrifice probably is not quite correct.

$$
11 \ldots
$$

## PxBP

12 BxP
....
On 12 NxP, Black stands well after 12 , . , $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 4$.

| $12 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $14 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 4$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 4$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $13 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $15 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 4$ | $\ldots .$. |

$15 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 4$ is not bad for Black either.

| $15 . \operatorname{N}$ | N-R5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 16 Q-Q2 | Q-K1 |
| 17 QR-K1 | N-K4 |

Black stands better (Wade-Penrose, Hastings 1961-2).
Sub-sub-variant 2
(From last diagram)
11 P-B3
Though a bit better than the previous variant, this is not too satisfactory. One example may suffice.
$11 . . .2$
12 B-Q2
13 R-B1
$P-B 5$
$P-K N 4$
$14 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$
$15 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5$
$\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 3$
P-QR3
P-N5
P-N6

The alpha and omega of Black's at. tack.

| 18 PXNP | N-R4 | 22 | R-K1 | Q-R5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $19 \mathrm{P} \mathrm{\times BP}$ | PxKBP | 23 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | Q-R8 $\dagger$ |
| $20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ | 24 | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | Q-R7 |
| $21 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 6$ | 25 | P×P | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{R} 5$ |
|  |  | 26 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 1$ |  |

Now Black could have won by $26 \ldots$ NxP!! 27 PxN, P-B6! (Pachman-Padevski, Dresden 1955).

Sub-sub-variant 3
(From last diagram)

## 11 PxP

As seen from the preceding, this is really the main variation.
$11 \ldots$

## N×BP

11 , . PxP 12 P-B4 gives White somewhat better chances: $12, \ldots \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KN} 3$ $13 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2[13 \ldots \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3,13 \ldots$. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1,13 . . \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 3$ and $13 \ldots \mathrm{PxP}$ are neither better nor worse] $14 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$, P-K5 $15 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 316 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 4, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 417$ PxP e.p. PxP 18 P-QN4, P-B4 19 PxP, PxP $20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$, and White has the initiative (Reshevsky-Benko, Buenos Alres 1960).

```
12 P-B3
```

It is to be noted that, in this varia. tion, White maneuvers his King Knight (not his Queen Knight) to K4. SchmidGligorich (Hamburg 1965) ran: $12 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 4$
(the Queen Knight), N-B3 $13 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ $14 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 315 \mathrm{NxN} \dagger$, QxN $16 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 2$, PxP 17 PxP, Q-B2 18 B -QB4. Here Black tried the risky shot $18 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 4$ and won, but 18 . , , B-B4 is safer and quite satisfactory. Naturally, the loss camnot be pinned firmly on White's Queen Knight maneuver, but it is a fact that Black obtained an easy game.

| $12 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $13 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| $14 \mathrm{~N} / 2-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\ldots .$. |

Note this is the King Knight.

$$
14 \ldots \quad P-B 4
$$

White stands better after $14 \ldots \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 1$ $15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 216 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3$.
15 B-Q3
P-QR3
16 P-QR4
N-R4

In this position, Geller and Petrosyan took a draw; it seems neither side holds an advantage.

## Sub-variation C

## (From the Key Position)

10 P-B3
The earlier White makes this move. the better he can intercept Black's flank attack.

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
10 \ldots \text { P-N4! } \\
11 \text { P-KB4 }
\end{array}
$$

White's idea is clear: to close the King-side position so as to continue his Queen-side attack undisturbed.

## 11... P-KR4

11 . . . PxNP opens the position at the wrong moment. For White's pieces have more mobility, and he maintains preponderance in space by $12 \mathrm{PxP}, \mathrm{RxR} \dagger$ $13 \mathrm{KxR}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{KB3} 14 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 3$. On the other hand, 11 . . . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B5}$ is to White's taste: 12 P-KR4. P-QR4 13 N -N2, N-QB4 14 $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1 \quad 15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 1, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2 \quad 16 \quad \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$ (Benko-Eliskases, Buenos Aires 1960). For White's Kingside is safe, and he can quietly prepare by $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$ and $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} \cdot$ his Queen-side attack.

## 12 P-N5

Worth considering is 12 PxRP, PxRP $13 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$, except that, as yet at least, the sequel from Larsen-Tah] (1st Match game. Bled 1965) needs no improvement. 12 P-R5
Black doesn't permit the consolidating move, $13 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 4$.
$13 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 3$
P-B5
Black thus isolates White's King Knight Pawn, hoping to capture the lost sheep.

(Concluded on page 320 )

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



\section*{INTERNATIONAL

\section*{

##  <br> CUBA 1965

## Capablanca Memorial at Havana

## Invincibles in Combat

Botvimnik once declared Smyslov unbeatable in the endgame. And Najdorf. no minor expert either, made a similar statement as to Fischer. Here the two invincibles meet, but Fischer triumphs. A doubled Pawn which Smyslov apparently assessed as harmless is in fact a serious handicap as Fischer gloriously demonstrates.

## RUY LOPEZ

Robert J. Fischer Vassily Smyslov United States

Soviet Union
White

| 1 | P-K4 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | 3 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ |  |  |  |
| 2 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | 4 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 4$ |
|  |  | 5 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\cdots$ |

This old Steinitz line, very rarely adopted today, is considered less effective than the usual $50 \cdots$ as Black can take in the initiative with . . . P-Q1 before White does.

| $5 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q3}$ | 7 QN-Q2 | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $6 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $8 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN4} 4$ |
|  |  | $9 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 3!$ | $\ldots .$. |

Keres and other analysts give only 9 B-B2 arriving at a position with even chances with 9 . P-Q4 10 Q-K2. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 3$. The text is more effective probably even to the point of preventing 9 . . . P-Q4. Still, that is a question of extensive analysis (which Fischer may have undertaken).


There are safer alternatives.

1) $9 \ldots \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QR} 410 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ leads practically to the usual Tchigorin, with White now or soon playing P-Q4 where$\dagger=$ check; $\ddagger=\mathrm{dbl}$. check; $\mathrm{f}=\mathrm{dis} . \mathrm{ch}$.
by he has saved the tempo P-KR3 but expended one with the Queen Pawn.
2) 9
$\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 1$ as in the Breyer line.
3) $9 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 310 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ with a fair game.

## 10 Q-K2

PxP
If the capture is necessary, Black is better off leaving his Pawn on Q3.
The consistent move is 10 . . . B-K3 but that is dubious with White's Bishop on QN3. The point turns on the intricate consequences of $11 \mathrm{PxP}, \mathrm{BxP} 12 \mathrm{NxP}$ which Fischer may have studied and assessed as favoring White.

Instead. Smyslov clarifies the situation but only in the sense of acquiescing to a disadvantage which he considers negligible,

$$
11 \text { PxP B-K3 }
$$

Black's point. Other continuations, say, 11 . . . B-Q3 12 B-N5 enable White to retain the initiative more comfortably.

## 12 BxB

P×B
The doubled Pawn is a weakness, in. deed, but very hard to exploit. It has some positive value even in the middle game in that Black exerts some pressure along the King Bishop file.

## $13 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3$

Q-Q2
13 . . . B-Q3 seems more natural as preparation for . . . N-K2-N3 and. possibly, . . . N-KB5. But Smyslov has an entirely different idea.

$$
\begin{array}{llr}
14 \text { O-O } & \text { QR-Q1 } \\
15 \text { P-QR4 } & \text { Q-Q6 }
\end{array}
$$

Smyslov plans for the endgame, convinced apparently that the doubled Pawn will have no unfavorable signifi. cance.

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
16 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q} & R \times Q \\
17 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} & \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} \\
18 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 6 & \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q}
\end{array}
$$

Black goes in for an active defense with threat of $19 \cdots \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ ! and 20

NxN $\dagger$ weakening the enemy Pawns. That threat is parried by White.

| 19 | K-R1 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | 22 | R/1-R1 | KN-N1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20 | B-K3 | R-Q1 | 23 | R-R8 | R-Q8 $\dagger$ |
| 21 | P-R3 | P-R3 | 24 | K-R2 | RxR |

Here Smysloy offered a draw, but Fischer refused. On delicate questions. chess experts like lawyers often dis. agree. Fischer subsequently wins this case.


Once again, a precaution against 28 . N-Q5.


Here, almost suddenly is the decisive stroke. The threat is $37 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$, incidentally catching the Bishop but themati. cally winning the Pawn on K5, attacking it with all three minor pieces by $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ and $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 1-\mathrm{N} 2$.

$$
36 \ldots \quad P \times P
$$

There is no adequate defense. Black desperately seeks counterplay on the Queenside.

| 37 N $\times \mathrm{BP}$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 4$ | 39 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 1$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 38 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 6$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | 40 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ |

Now the threat is $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ or 41 NxP first.

40 . . .
P-B4
Black has nothing steadier. 40 N-Q5 41 P-B4 actually threatens a Black piece. The case is settled.

| 41 | $N-N 6!$ | $N \times N$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 42 | $R \times N$ | $P-B 5$ |
| 43 | $N-B 5$ | $\cdots$ |

White wins a piece.
43 . . . .
P-B6

Strong as this Pawn is, it cannot restore the balance.

41 B-B1
Resigns
After 44 . . N-Q5 $45 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 7 \dagger$, K-K2 $46 \mathrm{NxB}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 647 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 748 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 67$. K-B3 followed by 49 . . . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 8(\mathrm{Q})$ \% Black emerges only a Pawn down but in a hopeless position, the more so since the game here stood adjourned.

## The Strayed Star

Here White essays a gambit line which offers strong attacking chances. The line is very little known, however. and. in fact, White seems to have reached it only incidentally. At any rate, he misses a star move and cannot then get compensation for the Pawn sacrificed.

## Dr. Heinz Lehmann

R. J. Fischer

Uaited States

Black
White
1 P-K4 P-QB4 $2 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ 3 P-Q4 $4 \mathrm{NxP} \quad \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{KB}$

Whether Black's last is playable or not remains to be seen. At any rate, White now obtains an extremely dangerous attack.
9 B-B3
B-N2
$11 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{B}$
12 PxP
13 Q-K2
$\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 5$ P-N5

A star move, Even $14 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 1$, however, poses difficult problems as $15 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3$ then threatens while $15 \ldots \mathrm{~N} / 2 \mathrm{xP} 16$ NxN, Q-Q5 $\dagger$ fails against 17 B-K3! as does a move like $15 \ldots$ Q-B2 because of 16 Q-K4!

14 . . .
N/5xKP
Here is the crucial move of the open. ing and of the entire game.

$15 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{N}$ ?
Here White strays, getting too little compensation for his Pawn though Black still has to play very accurately.

Najdorf, who happened to be in New York, was shown this game and recalled that $15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5$ was once played with dev. astating effect.

Undoubtedly, $15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5$ ! is best and makes Black's task extremely difficult. The probability exists that Fischer has even prepared a good line of defense. But White still has nothing better and, if 15 B-N5 fails, the sacrifice is wrong.

At this time, it is impossble to pursue the consequences of $15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5$ ! in their complicated detail. All that can be said now is that Black apparently must reply: $15 \ldots \mathrm{NxN} \dagger 16 \mathrm{QxN}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 4$.

$$
15 \ldots \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5
$$

$\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}$
Now $16 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5$ has not the same effect as Black can reply $16 \ldots$ B-K2 with out being exposed to $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 6 \%$.

| 16 | Q-N3 $\dagger$ | 19 | P-QN3 | O-O |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $17 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ | Q-N4! | 20 | P-QR4 | Q-B4 |
| 18 Q-K1 | B-K2 | 21 | Q-K2 | QR-B1! |
|  |  | 22 | P-B4 |  |

On 22 QxP. QxP. White cannot protect his Queen Knight Pawn. The text is a trap, but with a flaw.
$22 \ldots$ PxP e.p. 24 BxB
B-R3 Q-B2 25 QxN R-B4!

The flaw appears. Black recovers his piece, and his advanced, passed Pawn is irresistible.

26 Q-K2 RXN 27 QxRP Q-N5

28 KR-QN1 R-Q1 $\begin{array}{ll}29 & \text { P-R5 } \\ 30 & \text { Q-B4 }\end{array}$

White relies on his Queen Rook Pawn. but that fails.

| 30 | QxQ | 32 | R-QB1 | $\mathbf{R \times P}$ ! |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 31 | P-B7 |  | Resigns |  |

## WEST GERMANY 1965

## 3d European Team Championship at Hamburg

## Lost Variation

The game creates the impression of a weak player, choosing a poor variation and naturally losing. But that impres. sion is entirely wrong. Prof. Barendregt is actually a scientist who has indulged in the job of proving this variation is sound. Alas! the task proved a thankless one. "I lost not only the game but also the variation," Barendregt remarked, according to editor Teschner in the deutsche Schachzeitung.

## RUY LOPEZ

Dr. J. Barendregt Rudolf Teschner Holland West Germany
White Black

| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $3 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $2 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | $4 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $\mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
|  |  | $5 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\ldots .$. |

The text, considered premature is Barendregt's pet variation.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
5 \ldots \text { P-KN5 } \\
6 \text { P-KR3 } & \text { P-KR4 }
\end{array}
$$

Here is why castling is frowned at: obviously, White cannot accept the sacrifice without subjecting himself to an irresistible attack.

The Bishop cannot be left, however, permanently en prise; sooner or later, it must retreat or exchange; and White then emerges with the edge. Such has been Barendregt's general idea. He fails to prove it, at least in this game.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
7 \text { P-Q3 } & \text { Q-B3 } \\
8 \text { QN-Q2 } & \ldots .
\end{array}
$$

The alternative: 8 PxB, PxP $9 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5$, Q-R3 10 N-KR3, Q-R5 11 B-N5, Q-124, given by Teschner, favors Black.

| 8 | N-K2 |
| ---: | :--- |
| 9 | R-Ki |
| 10 | P-Q4 |

This delayed push in the center seems to be one of Barendregt's main points.
Capturing is still premature, as Teschner points out: 10 PxB, PxP $11 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 2$. B-B4! followed by . . . P-N6.


After the text, however, White is ready to accept and refute the sacrifice: 11 PxB, RPxP.

Then, on 12 N-R2, Q-R5 13 QN-B1, White must win. And, on $12 \ldots$ RxN $13 \mathrm{KxR}, \mathrm{QxP} 14 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5 \div 15 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1$. Black has no promising continuation.

12 PxP seems a good alternative, and White must win after 12 . . . NxP 13 NxN. Or $12 \ldots$ Q-Q1 $13 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 2, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 6$ $14 \mathrm{P} x \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 4 \div 15 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1, \mathrm{NxP} 16 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2$ ! Q-B3 17 QN-B1, Q-N3 18 B-K3, BxB 19 QxB, N-N5 20 Q-KB3, Q-R4 21 P-K5! [better than $21 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1, Q-\mathrm{B} 4 \dagger$ ], and Black is helpless against the threat of 22 $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 1$.

$$
10 \text {. . . . }
$$

## B-Q3!

Still, Black finds a way to maintain the status quo.

## 11 PxB

Here is the capture, much delayed and yet disastrously premature.
White must shake off the pin by 11 $K-\mathrm{B} 1$. Then Black can no longer rely on the sacrifice; but there is nothing wrong with his game after 11 . . B-K3, Teschner remarks.

```
11\ldots. RP\timesP
1 2 \mathrm { N } - \mathrm { R } 2
RPXP
```


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

Apparently, White expects only $12 \ldots$ Q-R5 which fails against 13 QN-B1. The alternative: $12 \mathrm{PxP}, \mathrm{BxP} 13 \mathrm{NxB}$ also loses, Teschner points out, because of 13 . . . Q-R5 14 K-B1, N-B5!

Black, however, has an additional sacrifice which is devastating.

## MASTER CHESS BOARDS

Hand in-laid high quality boards polished to a high finish.
Regulation 2 inch squares on solid one-piece wood base.

Exceptionally suitable for gifts, presentations and personal use.


Classic black and white squares. Model A. Straight board \$ 9.00 Model B. Folding board $\$ 11.00$

Beautiful similated marble squares. Model C. Straight board $\$ 9.00$ Model D. Folding board $\$ 11.00$
All boards are hand-crafted and are a chessman's delight. Bases are felted.

## Immediate Delivery

Add $\$ 1,00$ for mail charge.

## Russell and Russell Co. 47 South Street Quincy, Mass.



White is quite helpless before the threats of 14 . . . PxPs and 14 , . . $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 2 .[14, ., \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ fails against 15 QxP†].

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
14 & R-K 2 \\
15 & P-K 5
\end{array}
$$

$$
\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} \S
$$

-••
Or $15 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5 \dagger 16 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 7 \dagger 17$ $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 8 \dagger 18 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 6 \dagger$ and mate next.
$15 \ldots$
$\mathrm{BxP}+$
$16 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B} \dagger$
. . .

Black still mates by force after 16 $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5 \dagger 17 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 7 \dagger$ though now it takes a few more moves.

| $16 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{R}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Now Black threatens 17, | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| Nee again and also $17 \ldots \mathrm{~N}, \ldots$ |  |

## 17 K-R1 Resigns

O-O-O

Mate by force is inevitable: 18 N-B1, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 1 \div 19 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 2, \mathrm{RxN} \dagger$ etc. or 19 P-N6.

## One Tempo

In this game, White sacrifices to activate his pieces; but Black, soon after, counter sacrifices sharply: and White declines, persisting in his original Pawn sacrifice which fails under the altered circumstances.

A fine success by Lothar Schmid, the West German star in this tournament.

## KING'S INDIAN DEFENSE

## M. Botvinnik

Soviet Union
White

| 1 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB4}$ |
| 3 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ |

L. Schmid West Germany Black
N-KB3
P-Q3
P-K4
Apparently, Schmid has spectalized on this line.

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

Possibly, White gains a slight edge by 4 PxP. At least, he can do better than in Kraidman-Schmid, page 144, May issue, at Tel Aviv 1964. Botvinnik has a predilection for early endgames if they are promising. He realizes, however, the promise is too dim here. Nor is he eager to enter upon a variation which his opponent must have studied particularly well.

$$
4 \ldots
$$

$$
\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3
$$

Black insists on a quick clarification of the situation in the center.


White obliges by reverting to more usual roads.
On 5 PxP, White has a good game after 5 . . . NxP 6 P-K4! e.g. 6 . . . $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 57 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ ? $8 \mathrm{NxN}, \mathrm{BxB} 9$ NxQBP! But Black holds by 5 . . . PxP 6 $\mathrm{QxQ} \stackrel{\mathrm{F}}{ }$. KXQ though he must be careful for his next few moves: e.g. $7 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 28 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} \dagger$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 2!$ or 7 N-KN5. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 2$ ! 8 N-N5, N-K1 9 P-QN3, K-B3 or P-KR3.

5 P-K4, B-N5 yields equality.
$5 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ may offer a tiny edge, mainly since 5 . . B-N5 $6 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 27$ $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ carries the threat of 8 NXP and so Black must trade off his better Bishop ar else lose time.

5 P-KR3 is a somewhat strange move but White's best for retaining tension in the center. He then is ready for 5 $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ and can refute 5 . . . P-K5 by 6 N-KN5, B-B4 7 P-KN4, B-N3 8 B-N2, Q-K2 $9 \quad \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 5, \mathrm{NxN} 10 \mathrm{PxN}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 111$ Q-B2. P-K6 12 Q-R4\%:

| 5 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 6 | P-K4 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KN} 3$ |
| 7 | P-KN3 | $\ldots$. |

7 B-K2 seems more natural as the fianchetto does not really improve the restricted scope of White's King Bishop. Still, White has his particular reason for the text: he is anticipating a later . . . P-KB5.

| $7 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | 9 | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $8 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $10 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 1$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4$ |  |

Black's counter action is usual and particularly dangerous with his Queen Knight on K2. The immediate threat is 11. . P-B5.
$11 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 3$
White prevents . . . P-B5 while also preparing for $12 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$. The actual reason lor White's fianchetto is revealed: he needs the Pawn on KN3.

| $11 . .$. | P-KR3 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 12 P-B4 | $K-R 2$ |
| 13 B-Q2 | $\cdots$. |

On $13 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$, that Bishop is soon exposed to a . . N-KB4.

White has checked the King-side danger but has obtained only an even game. $13 \ldots \quad \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P} \quad 16 \mathrm{NxBP} \quad \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 4$ $14 \mathrm{~N} / 3 \times \mathrm{P} \quad \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{KB} 4 \quad 17 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1 \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ 15 K-R1 PxP 18 P-QN4 ....

White is eager to increase the scope of his pieces. He avoids 18 PxP e.p., however, as it works equally well for Black. In fact, White then has difficulty in proceeding. Note especially that 19 B-QB3, which is most desirable, fails against 19 . . N-K6. Nor does 19 Q-K2,

Q-K2 $20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ hold promise in view of 20 . . . B-R3 $21 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$.

18
P-N3
18 . . . PxP $19 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$ ! [19 BxP? N -K6] gives White a very strong initiative.
19 PxP
NPxP
$20 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 6$ !
....

This enticing combination is quite desirable as otherwise, say, after $20 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2$, White's game has a slightly uncomfortable touch of passivity. Here is where White aims to activate his pieces at the expense of a Pawn.

| $20 \ldots$ | $B \times N$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| 21 P×B | $Q-K 2$ |
| 22 N-B3 | $\ldots$ |

Apparently, White wins a tempo by the attack on the Rook. He aims to hold the Pawn on K6 at least temporarily.


Here is Black's sharp counter combination. It wins a tempo for Black and creates great complications; but, so far as this annotator can see, they ought to favor White ultimately.

Probably, White expected 22 . . . QR-N1 23 B-Q5, N-Q5 losing his King Pawn but gaining strong dynamic compensation starting with 24 RxR : e.g. 24 . . BxR $25 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 1, \mathrm{RxR} 26 \mathrm{QxR}$, NxKP $27 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Ns}$.

## $23 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 5$

White hopes to get sufficient play for the Pawn, but his hope fails to materialize.

Accepting the sacrifice seems to offer better chances despite the tremendous complications. 23 BxR , NxPt! 24 PxN , Q-R6 $\quad 25 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1$ poses three main lines of play:

1) 25 . . RxB is insufficient on account of $26 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 527 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7$;
2) 25. . $\mathrm{QxP}+26 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 527$ RxR offers Black no adequate continua. tion: e.g. 27 . . . B-Q5 $\dagger 28 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 7 \dagger$ $29 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{QxB}+30 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 3$;
1) 25 , . N-N5 threatens mate by 26 . . Q-R7 and also by 26 . . $B-Q 5 \div$. So White must give up his Queen, but he gets good compensation: 26 QxN! RxR† 27 RxR, QxQ 28 N-K4: with chances rather on White's side.

| $23 \ldots$ | QR-N1 | 25 Q-B2 | N-Q5 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 24 N-B4 | Q-Q2 | 26 Q-K4 | R-N7 |

Black has also gained activity for his pieces and now takes another Pawn.

| 27 | B-QB3 | $R \times P$ | $29 R-N 7$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 28 | R-QN1 | Q-B4 | $30 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R} 2$ |
|  |  | $31 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
|  |  | $\ldots$ |  |

$\dagger=$ check: $\ddagger=$ dbl. check: $\xi=$ dis. ch.

31 QxP is met by $31 \ldots$ RxR 32 BxR. $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 6$ or $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 5$.
31 ....
Q×R
$32 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 5$

White sets a trap: 32 UxP 33
NxB , KxN $34 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 7+$, $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 2 \quad 35 \mathrm{RxNt}$, QxR $36 \mathrm{QxQ} \div$. KxQ $37 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 5 \dagger$. But Black sees it.

| 32 | R-KB7 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $33 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B4}$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathrm{R}+$ |
| 34 BxR | Q-B4 |



35 Q×Q
Psychologically, this is an interesting moment. It appears that 35 QxP must fail after some discovered attack or other on the White Queen. When careful check reveals, however, that there is no fatal discovery and so 35 QxP is played, White is painfully aware he has overlooked the simple 35 . . . P-N4! which wins a piece. For $36 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ or $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R} 3$ is answered by $36 \ldots \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{NS} \div$.
$35 \ldots P \times Q$

Despite the Bishops of opposite colors and even the isolation of all Black's Pawns, this endgame is too bad for White.

| 36 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 37 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 6$ |
| 38 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 6$ | $\ldots$. |

Obviously, $38 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q5}$ is hopeless also.

| $38 \ldots$ | B-K4 | 40 | B-N5 | N-K6 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 35 N-Q3 | NxP | 41 | N-N4 | P-QR4 |
|  |  | 42 | N-B6 |  |

Here the game was adjourned, and White resigned without resuming play.

Black inevitably wins a piece or promotes a Queen by 42 . . . P-R5 43 N-N4 [43 BxP, P-Q6!], P-R6: e.g. 41 $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 3, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 315 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 446 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 2$, N-B6 47 B-B4, P-Q4 48 B-N3, P-Q6 49 $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 750 \mathrm{NxN}, \mathrm{BxN} 51 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ $52 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 2, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 453 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 454 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 3$, P-R5 etc.

## UNITHD STATES

## PUERTO RICO 1965

## U. S. Open at San Juan

## Old Tale in Modern Terms

The regular variation adopted here by Black places a Knight on the Queenside rim. If action then switches elsewhere, Black lacks the services of tiat stranded Knight. It happens so in this game. It is an old tale, retold in modern terms.

KING'S INDIAN DEFENSE
Pal Benko
Robert Byrne
White

| 1 | P-Q4 | N-KB3 | 9 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | P-B4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | N-KB3 | P-KN3 | 10 | P-QR3 | Q-B2 |
| 3 | P -B4 | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | 11 | Q-B2 | P-QR3 |
| 4 | P-KN3 | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | 12 | P-N3 | P-QN4 |
| 5 | B-N2 | P-Q3 | 13 | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | P×P |
| 6 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | 14. | PxP | P-K4 |
| 7 | O-O | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 1$ | 15 | QR-N1 | B-Q2 |
| 8 | P-Q5 | N-QR4 | 16 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{R}$ |

The position favors White as Black's Queen Knight does little and needs too many moves and possibly some luck to find better employment. For the time being. Black's disadvantage is almost negligible, but there is considerable danger, if King-side action develops, for example, that it will grow.
$17 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{QR} 1$
P-B4
18 R×R $R \times R$
19 P-K3!
. . . .

Apparently, White aims at action with P-B4 and possibly P-N4, either move to be timed properly.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
19 \ldots \text { Q-Q1 } \\
20 \text { N-K2 } & \text { P-K5 }
\end{array}
$$

The text worsens matters as White's KB4 is now open to his Knight. $20 \ldots$ $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 4$ and 20 . . . $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ and, if 21 $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4 . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$, are comparatively better lines.

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
21 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B} & \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{B} \\
22 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3 & \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 1
\end{array}
$$

## WINDSOR CASTLE CHESSMEN
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$$
\begin{array}{llr}
23 & P-N 4! & R-N 2 \\
24 \text { P×P } & \text { P×P } \\
25 & \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 4 & , \ldots
\end{array}
$$

Now White clearly stands better.
$25 \ldots$
R-KB2
$\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 2$

Both Black's "fianchettoed" Knights are poorly ensconced, and the Queen Knight little chance to reach Kt.

| 27 P-B3! | PxP |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 28 N×P | P-QR4 |
| 29 K-R1 | P-R5 |

It seems Black aims to block the Queen Kaight tile by . . . N-QR4-NG.
$30 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 6$ !
$\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}$
Black's Queen has no good move: 30 $\ldots$ Q-R4 31 Q-N2! or $30 \ldots$ Q-B1 31 N/3-N5!
31 PxN
R-N2
32 N-R2!

White attacks the Knight and prepares both B-Q5 and P-K4. The latter aims at removing Black's King Bishop Pawn to permit $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 4$.


## FINISHING TOUCH

(Concluded from page 299)

| 1 | $R-B 8!$ | $R \times R$ | 4 | $P-R 5$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 2 | $P \times R(Q)$ | $B \times Q$ | 5 | $P \times P$ |
| 3 | $P-R 4!$ | $P-B 4!$ | 6 | $K-Q 3$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |

And the Rook Pawn wins.
Finally, the Rinck example. Henry Rinck
Deustsche Schachzeitung 1907.


White to move and win
This early piece combines blockade with a pin, a compact, unique miniature. Triggered probably by Mouterde's forerunner, Rinck composed a number of related studies in 1915 and 1916. They don't show quite the same strategyneither does this one here. But this is a precision piece in its own right.
1 P-N7 B-Q4 3 B-B3! B-K3
2 P-B4! NxP 4 B-N4!

Here then we see Black virtually a piece down, his stranded Knight. and White's advantage is overwhelming.

32 Q-N7
Black has noted that 33 BxN is no real threat: 33 . . . RxB! 34 RxR , B-B3t. Nor is 33 RxN, RxB! [but now, of course, $33 \ldots$ QxB mate] etc. Based on these facts, he tries a combination which is quite incorrect. Since he stands to lose now, anyway, the damage is negligible.
33 BxN
R×B
34 R-N1
B-B3 $\dagger$

The saving move, Black must have thought, expecting $35 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N}+36$ $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 2, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5$.

35 P-K4!
White destroys Black's illusion and simply wins the Queen.

| 35 | $\ldots$ |
| :--- | :--- |$\quad$| $\mathrm{BxP} \mathrm{\dagger} \dagger$ |
| ---: |
| Resigns |

## NEW YORK 1965 Marshall C. C. Open Championship New Talent

This game serves to introduce a new talent, John Grefe of Hoboken, a boy of whom more certainly will be heard. In fact, we have another fine game of his from this same tournament for which there is no space in this issue.

## CARO-KANN DEFENSE

John Grefe
Dr. A. A. Mengarini
White
Black

| 1 | P-K4 | P-QB3 | 3 PxP | PxP |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 2 | P-Q4 | P-Q4 | 4 P-QB4 | N-KB3 |
|  |  | $5 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |  |

5 . . . P-K3 is a modest but steady alternative.

$$
6 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3
$$

B-B4
Black's rather quiet move doesn't fit into the sharp variation. The main line leads to complications but a near equal. ity: $6 \ldots$ B-N5. As for $6 \ldots$ P-K3. it is effectively countered by $7 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$.

7 Q-N3!
Well calculated.

| 7 Q-N5 1 | N-QR4 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 8 Q-Q2 |  |



9 PxP!!
Here is White's clever point; offering his Queen, he actually wins Pawns.


Black has the Queen for two pieces; but his position is too bad, lacking even a satisfactory defense against $14 \mathrm{NxP} \dagger$ : e.g. 13 . . P-K3 14 B-B4, B-Q3 15 $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 5, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5 \dagger 16 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 217 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ etc.

With the text, Black threatens: 9 . . . $\mathrm{BxQ} 10 \mathrm{BxB} \div, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$.

| 10 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KN} 3$ | 13 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN3}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 11 | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |  |  |  |
| 12 B 5 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | 14 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| $12 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ | 15 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 1$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 4$ |
|  |  |  | $16 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |  |

White can afford to give two Rooks for the Queen.
$\qquad$ $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 2$
On 16 . . P-N5 $17 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 4$, QxR 18 RxQ [better than $18 \mathrm{NxB} \dagger$ ]. RxR $\ddagger 19$ $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 1$, Black is handicapped by inadequate co-operation of his pieces. From a practical point of view, however, this line may be his best.
$\begin{array}{lllll}17 & \text { Q-Q2! } & \text { Q-N3 } & 19 & \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 5 \\ 18 & \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 4 & \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2 & 20 \mathrm{~N} 4 \\ \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3 & \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 3\end{array}$
Black speculates on $21 \mathrm{NxB}, \mathrm{NxN} 22$ N-Q7, QxP 23 QxQ, NxQ as White cannot take the Exchange since his Bishop is loose. White's next prepares to win the Exchange.

## 21 B-B3

P-KR4
Black relies on tactics too fancy to be true. He is in a losing position, anyhow, though.

| $22 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| $23 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 7$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| $24 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R} 3$ |

Here's Black project: $25 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 2, \mathrm{BxR}$ etc. may lead to a draw.

## 25 QxB! <br> Resigns

White emerges with two Rooks and a Bishop for his Queen, aside from other advantages.

## SPOTLIGHT ON OPENINGS

(Concluded from page 315)

## 14 K-R1

Larsen improves upon Wade-Reshevsky (Buenos Aires 1960): 14 Q-Kl, K-B2! 15 QxP, R-R1 16 Q-B2, R-R4 17 P-KR4, Q-R1 with Black's position superior.
14 . . .
K-B2
15 P-B5
....

According to Tahl's second, Koblenz, the game is already strategically decided.

| $15 \ldots$ | $R-R 1$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 16 Q-N3 | P-N3 |
| 17 PxQP | $\ldots$. |

Perhaps, $17 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6$ is even stronger.

| 17 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | 21 | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R} 6$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| $18 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 3$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | 22 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KN} 1$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QN} 1$ |
| $19 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $\mathrm{NP} \times \mathrm{N}$ | 23 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |
| $20 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 4$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | 24 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |
|  |  |  | 25 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
|  |  | $\ldots .$. |  |  |

Here 25 QR-QB1 seems even better. The point is that 25 . . . P-R3 fails against $26 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7 \dagger$, K-N1 $27 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5$ ! PxN $28 \mathrm{RxN} \dagger$ ! etc. or 26 . . . B-K2 $27 \mathrm{NxP} \ddagger$.

| $25 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | 28 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{KB} 1$ | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $26 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 7$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ | $29 \mathrm{KR} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ |  |
| 27 NXQ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 4$ | $30 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 6$ |  |  |

Larsen won despite his Pawn minus.

## Pstal GHESS TII

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

## Contents of Kit

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

Bought separately, the contents would amount to $\$ 8.75$. The complete kit costs only $\$ 7.00$. To order, just mail the coupon below.


I chess Review
Postal Chess Dept.
134 West 72d St.,
New York, N. Y. 10023
1 enclose $\$ 7.00$. Please send me a complete Postal Chess Kit by return mail.

## I Name

ADDRESS
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CITY ...................... STATE


## FIRST PRIZE . . \$250.00 <br> Second Prize $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 0}$ |Sixth Prize $\$ 40$ Third Prize Fourth Prize Fifth Prize <br> $\qquad$ Seventh Prize $\$ 30$ Eighth Prize \$25 Ninth Prize <br> $\$ 20$

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.
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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-winner-and, at least, you'll have lots of fun. For all classes of postal players compete together in this "open" Postal Chess event.

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

## MAIL YOUR ENTRY NOW

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

CHESS REVIEW 134 West 72d St., New York, N. Y. 10023
$\square$ Cbeck bere if you are a now. comer to Postal Chess. Start me as CLASS

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

Print Clearly
Check bere if already a registered Postalite.
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[^0]:    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!

[^1]:    "Play Chess every Sunday with a GRANDMASTER." You can enter exhibition from 2 P.M. to 6 P.M. Fee $\$ 2.00$.

    Chess Studio Rossolimo
    191 Sullivan St., New York GR 5-9737

[^2]:    * For better enjoyment and understonding.
    iny solving the problems first.-Ed. try solving the problems fiest:-Ed,

[^3]:    $\dagger=$ check; $\ddagger=$ dbl. check; $\wp=$ dis. ch.

[^4]:    *Weighted point totals are based on the following scale: 1.0 points per win in the prelinss: 2.2 in semi-ftnals: and 4.5 in finals. Draws count half these values.

