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No. 1
M. H. Kleiman White to move and draw


To and fro.

No. 2
G. M. Kasparyan White to move and win


Horns of a dilemma.
No. 3
J. Selman

White to move and draw


Equine antic.
Solutions on page 375.

## ON THE COVER

Those of our readers who have also read from that fascinating chess raconteur Irving Chernev or simply from long-past issues of Chess Review will know of chess-fabled Stroebeck. Here then is another item of Stroebeckiana. This, Professor M. S. Zitzman of West Chester, Pennsylvania, tells us, is the only "chess money" ever printed. The faces of the notes appear on the cover, the reverse below. Those of you who can read German and have good magnifying glasses may follow the inscriptions. Our interest lies in the chess designs of this unique currency, which may not get you on even a blacked-out subway train but does carry happy connotations for chess spielers, fans and kibitzers.


The bills vary in color mainly on a scroll-like back. ground [best seen on the 50 pfennings (?) note below-it did not reproduce well in some colors in these line cuts]. The paper on each is near-white, the print in jet-black, the serial numbers in russet-brown.

The "scroll" coloration for the 25 pfg note is a pale violet. The design is the same as on the 50 pfg note in each instance.
The shade of the background on the 50 pfg note is a light orange - brown [the red in. herent in that color does "take" for a line cut]. The large note has a green tint.
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## INTERNATIONAL

## Ascendant Star

International grandmaster Victor Korchnoy, a three-time winner of the Soviet championship, is again in the news with two big triumphs-a $91 / 2 \cdot 31 / 2$ tally against a tough field at Yerevan, Russia (which included world champion Tigran Petrosyan), and an invincible $141 / 2^{-1 / 2}$ accumulation in the Asztalos Memorial Tournament at Gyula, Hungary. In the latter contest, Honfi and Lengyel were far behind in a 9.6 tie for second. The Yerevan event saw Petrosyan and Leonid Stein tie for second with $81 / 2 \cdot 41 / 2$ each. Indifferent scores were turned in by such luminaries as Portisch of Hungary, Matanovich of Yugoslavia, Filip of Czechoslovakia and Stahlberg of Sweden.

## Battle in Bulgaria

L. Kavalek of Czechoslovakia scored an outstanding $11-4$ to take a strong international event in Varna, Bulgaria. He was followed by Kolarov of Bulgaria with $91 / 2$ $51 / 2$, and a trio who were deadlocked at 9.6: Bobozov of Bulgaria, Matulovich of Yugoslavia and Lengyel of Hungary.
for the complete match, see pages $362-7$

## Chesswomen in Action

At an international women's tournament in the Soviet Union, W. Koslovskaia (USSR) placed first with $81 / 2 \cdot 21 / 2$, closely pursued by her compatriot Ranniku, 8-3. Nicolau of Rumania, $71 / 2 \cdot 31 / 2$, was third.

## Pralian Inṫerlude

A fourfold tie for first was registered in a Swiss tourney at San Benedetto del Tronto, Italy, when Nestler, Palmiotto, Porreca and Pavlovich each scored $51 / 2$ $21 / 2$. Severi was fifth with $5-3$. Countries that were represented in addition to Italy were England, France, Switzerland and Yugoslavia.

## Oựclassed

In a double-round student duel at Wurzburg, West Germany, the Dutch visitors were no match for their hosts and succumbed by $41 / 2-151 / 2$.

## Visił̂ors Edge Hosts

A Swiss tournament at Eastbourne in England, dubbed the "Open Championship," was won by two foreigners, H. Reefschlaeger of Germany and J. R. Roos of Holland, each $81 / 2-2 \frac{1}{2}$. English representatives K. B. Harmon, L. P. Burnett and P. N. Wallis tied for third through fifth with $8-3$ each.

From the Editors of Chess Review

## TO ALL CHESSPLAYERS

FAR AND NEAR
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## Transacłions in Thule

Oslo, Norway, was the scene of the Northern Championship, a round robin restricted to players from Denmark, Iceland, Norway and Sweden. F. Thorbergsson of Iceland and S. Johannessen of Norway headed the list with 9.2 each and then tied again in a playoff, after which Thorbergsson was granted top honors on the basis of a point evaluation.

## A Top for Holland

The Caltex international tournament for teams of four went to Holland on a tiebreak basis. England equaled Holland's $20-8$ match score, and both countries left West Germany far behind in third place with 15-13.

## The Return of Aben Rudy

We heard from Aben Rudy again recently. He was explaining the application of the term, "Irreducible Minimum" to chess. It comes up for example when a chess situation is so rare and peculiar that it, at the very least, must evoke a "The deuce you say!" "You know," he concluded, "when a position is positively weird or eery."

## Spassky Tied by Unzicker

At Sochi in the Soviet Union, the Tchigorin Memorial Tournament was won jointly by B. Spassky (Soviet Union) and W. Unzicker (Germany), each $101 / 2 \cdot 41 / 2$. Neither incurred loss. Third was Chirich (Yugoslavia), 10-5.

## Still the Queen

Nona Gaprindashvili retained the women's world championship by downing Alla Kushnir in a title match. Both are Soviet citizens.

## UNITED STATES

## REGIONAL AND INTERSTATE

## Pitłsburgh by One Point

In a match between Pittsburgh and Cleveland, the former gained a narrow victory by $71 / 2-61 / 2$. F. Sorenson, L. Gardner, W. Byland, G. Doschek, D. Lawrence and R. Kinney won for Pittsburgh, while R. Kause, E. Kossak, G. Kromp, L. Mhasz and L. Battes scored full points for Cleveland. The following three games were drawn (with Pittsburgh players named first): M. Lubell vs. J. Schroeder, D. McClellan vs. H. Hintzer and J. Kolts vs. J. Hoffman.

## With New England Students

An intercollegiate invitational team tournament, arranged by Norwich University of Vermont, resulted in a $5-0$ sweep for Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Next was the University of Massachusetts, followed by Norwich University and St. Anselm's College in New Hampshire.

## ALABAMA

With a 6.0 sweep, G. C. Bates won the Alabama Open, followed by Salvador Martinez, Jr., 5-1. The seventeen-player event was sponsored by the Birmingham Chess Club.

## CALIFORNIA

Captain John Hudson and John Blackstone, each $6-1$, tied for first in the eighty-five-player California Open. A slim ad-


ALLA KUSHNIR
She lost decisively to Nona Gaprindashvili, but she still has something.
vantage in tie-break points gave the official trophy to Hudson. Players with $51 / 2 \cdot 11 / 2$ scores were Z. Kovacs, D. Blohm, P. Perillo, M. Wilkerson and N. Wood.

## IOWA

In the strongest group of the Eleventh Annual Iowa Open, played in three sections, the name of Gilbert Ramirez led all the rest with a $5-0$ shutout. Scores of 4.1 in this forty-six-player section were garnered by Melvin Matherly, Paul Hersh, Dan Reynolds. Glen F. Proechel, Ray Wenzel, John G. Warren and Laszlo Ficsor. The "Middle Class" division was won by Matthew R. Baird, 4-1, and the Junior by Lee DeWitt, $41 / 2-1 / 2$.

## KANSAS

Wesley Koehler was the successful candidate in the Kansas Open with an in-
vincible 5-0. Second in the thirty-eightplayer tourney was John R. Beitling, $41 / 2^{-1 / 2}$. V. W. Harris, whose $4-1$ tally was shared by Robert Spies and Lee Magee, was declared state champion as highest ranking Kansan.

## LOUISIANA

Of the 38 players who tried conclusions at the Louisiana Chess Association Championship, A. L. McAuley predominated in first place with 6-1, ahead of George Lecompte, 5-1. It was a gratifying victory for McAuley insofar as he has had the frustrating experience of winding up as rumnerup for the past five years.

## MINNESOTA

A playoff to resolve a quadruple tie for first in the Minnesota Junior Championship was won by Brendan Godfrey, with Robert K. Johnson becoming runnerup, and James A. Davies and Ray McRoberts bracketed for the next two places. Each of the four scored $33 / 2-1 / 2$ in the regular twenty-six-player tournament.
In the Minnesota Equalizer Tournament, Ivan Kaszas collected the most "equalizer" points and thus won the firstplace trophy plus a money prize.
James H. Young and Laszlo Ficsor both scored 4-0 in the State Fair Chess Tornado. Young had a slight advantage in Solkoff points.

## NEBRASKA

G. Ramirez of Omaha won the state title with a 4-1 showing in the combined Nebraska State Championship and Midwest Open. Midwest honors went to C. Gant of New York, $41 / 2^{-1} / 2.22$ played.

## OHIO

The new state champion is Richard Noel, Jr., who piled up an unbeatable seven straight points. Edward Ernst and Thomas Mazchukowski were second and third with $6-1$ and $51 / 2 \cdot 11 / 2$ respectively.

## OREGON

In the Oregon Open, Viktors Pupols swept seven rounds to capture first, ahead


Legend has it, Trifunovich says, that anyone who rings the bell in this picturesque chapel near Bled has his prayer granted.


After game 5, Larsen, leading, looks cocky. No one truly knows what happened, but Tahl visited the chapel and the bell tolled.
of Ivars Dalbergs, 6-1. Third in the field of 48 entrants was Leif Karell, $51 / 2-11 / 2$.

## VERMONT

In the twenty-player Vermont Open at Rutland, Alan Morrill, John Curdo and Gerald Rubin each scored 4-1. George Mirijanian placed fourth.

## WISCONSIN

The Wisconsin Speed Championship, played in two sections, yielded a quadrangular final that was won by William Martz, $21 / 2,1 / 2$. Other finalists were: Nowak, 2-1; Weldon, $11 / 2-11 / 2$; Gaigals, $0-3$.

## LOCAL EVENTS

California. No sooner was grandmaster Pal Benko installed in new diggings at San Diego than he set about investigating (and conquering) new chess worlds. As a start, he won the sixty-two-player Southern California Open with a clear first of $51 / 2^{-1} / 2$. His fellow grandmaster, Larry Evans, headed a group of four at 5-1, placing second on a tiebreak. Benko will soon embark on a tour of the United States, during which he will give lectures, simultaneous displays and simultaneous clock exhibitions. He will also be available for individual match games. Anyone interested in arranging for Benko's services should communicate with the Steiner Chess Group of San Diego, 3447 Ingraham Street, San Diego, California 92109.
In the Northern California Championship, Don Sutherland and Carroll Capps each scored $41 / 2-1 / 2$, with Sutherland winning out on a tiebreak. Arthur Wang, Allen Bourke and Ira Pohl scored 4.1 each. There were 46 players.
The San Francisco Bay Area Championship, a thirty-five-player event, went

## READERS' FORUM

The diagram under this department in October, page 293, unfortunately had a Pawn missing (Black on Black's KN6). Arnold Berman of Jericho, New York, like many pointed out the flaw but, unlike all others, gave the correction. For those interested, here are the corrected position and terms.


1 White to move - mate in 3
2 Remove Knight - mate in 4
3 Remove Knight and Pawn on R2 mate in 5

L. ELDON JAMES

American Legion National Commander, commenting on the Armed Forces Championship in Washington, Nov. 6-13: "We would like to see opportunities for competition against the champions of the Armed Forces of other countries." Dept. of Defense authorities, with the American Chess Foundation, are exploring in that direction.
to Ira Pohl with $41 / 2-1 / 2$. A quadruple tie at 4.1 was registered by Joe Fliegal, David Blohm, Robert Shean and John Jaffray.
A 7.0 shutout was credited to William Batchelder in a round robin for the championship of Stanford University.
In the Pasadena junior title tournament. David Forthoffer of Glendale High School placed first with an outstanding $61 / 2^{-1 / 2}$.
The Woodpushers' Tourney at the Whittier Chess Club, attended by 40 xylomanipulators, was won by J. Barnard, 6-0.
According to Terrachess, the first two sections to finish their schedule in the City Terrace Invitational Cats' Tournament were the Jaguars and the Bobcats. C. Larson was jaguar-in-chief with 7-1, while H. Guadarrama became head bobcat with 8-1.
In the South California Amateur Open, which featured an outpouring of 81 chess fans, G. Gean and E. Warner shared first and second prizes with a $51 / 2-1 / 2$ record. Following with 5-1 each were T. Fries, S. Geller, R. Lalazarian, M. Rubin and S. Rubin. The competition was restricted to players who either rated under 2000 or were unrated.
The Panthers and the Leopards have now joined the Jaguars and the Bobeats in completing their schedules in the City Terrace (Los Angeles) Invitational Cats' Tournament. S. Salter, 8-2, emerged as top Panther, and J. Porth, $61 / 2-11 / 2$, be-

## An Original Approach to Chess Strategy PAWN POWER

 IN CHESSby HANS KMOCH

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

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

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

DAVID McKAY COMPANY, Inc., 750 Third Av., New York, N. Y. 10017
came foremost swinging Leopard. The Lions and the Wildcats are expected to be heard from shortly. Where are the Tigers in this array of fanged felines?
Angelo Sandrin achieved a 5-0 shut-out in the annual $30 / 30$ tournament of the Chicago Industrial Chess League. Separated only by slight tie-break margins, Walter Grombacher, Ted DeParry and Victor Narkevicius, each 4-1 in game points, finished second, third and fourth in the order listed. Twenty-two contestants took part.

Georgia. Brad Wade, $51 / 2-1 / 2$, was a clear first in the Atlanta Open. Dave Truesdel and Norman T. Whitaker, 5-1 each, took second and third respectively on a tiebreak. Forty-seven players competed.

Illinois. The Gompers Park Chess Club of Chicago defeated the Evanston and Metro Chess Clubs by $7-6$ and $11-2$ respectively.
Indiana. At Indianapolis, a total of 47 players reported for action in the Hoosier Open, the main event of which was credited to Ed Vano, $41 / 2-1 / 2$. Bunched at 4-1 were Richard Braden and Theodore Pehnec (sharing second and third on a tie-break), Henry Tyler and Ernst (fourth and fifth respectively on a similar basis) and Dan Gregg and Wendel Lutes (tied for sixth and seventh).
A one-day Indianapolis Chess Club
tourney went to George Berry, 4-0, followed by Dan Gregg and N. Van Duesen, each 3-1. Ten players competed.
Kentucky. In the title tourney of the Louisville Chess Club, G. Pat Forsee came in first with five straight victories. Runnerup was Richard O'Bryan, 4-1.
Louisiana. Premier honors in the nineman championship of the Catholic Chess Club in New Orleans were gained by David Levin, $41 / 2-1 / 2$. William Hale, $31 / 2$. $11 / 2$, was second.
Maine. An eleven-player round robin for the championship of the Portland Chess Club was gained by undefeated John Morrill, 9-1, followed by Dr. Edward Blumberg, $81 / 2 \cdot 1 \frac{1}{2}$.
Massachusetts. In a thirty-six-player open at Lynn, John Curdo triumphed with a 5.0 sweep. Thomas McCafferty, Donald V. Haffner and Alan C. Morrill, each 4-1, placed second, third and fourth respectively on tiebreaks.
Minnesota. In the University of Minnesota Championship, Ronald Lifson was first on a tiebreak, ahead of runnerup Gary Boos. Both had scored $41 / 2-1 / 2$ in game points.

In the Premier Section of the Tribute to Stearns Chess Festival in Cleveland, James Schroeder crushed all opposition with an 11.0 steamroller. Al Nasvytis was runnerup with $81 / 2-21 / 2$. The Candidates'
and the Open Sections were won respec'tively by Lee Battes and Edward Case, Jr., each $81 / 2-21 / 2$.
New Jersey. A sharply contested match between the Jersey City " $Y$ " and the Elizabeth Chess Club ended in a $41 / 2-31 / 2$ decision favoring Jersey City. Winners for the latter were H. Faivus, C. Diskin, M. Connelly and E. Allen, while Elizabeth victors were M. Strand, I. Ellner and G. Quinn. M. Riff of Jersey City drew with E. Rosenfeld.
New York. The huge, city-wide tournament for New York youngsters under seventeen, reported in Chess Review for September (pages) 262-63), has now drawn to a close with a 5.0 sweep in the finals by sixteen-year-old William Smith. Second was Richard Sulzbach, $31 / 2-1 / 2$, and third was Robert Gwydir, 3-2.

At Poughkeepsie, Donald Schultz downed Dick Meyerson by 2.0 in a playoff for the Chadwick Chess Club title.
Ohio. Lee Battes was crowned Cleveland junior chess king by virtue of a $41 / 2-1 / 2$ victory in a sixteen-player field. Gregg Stark, who lost only to Battes, was second with 4-1.
Pennsylvania. The sixth Annual Gateway Open in Pittsburgh, drawing a large crowd of 68 players, was won by Dr. Erich W. Marchand with a $5-0$ sweep, ahead of John Telega, $41 / 2 \cdot 1 / 2$. Tallies of

## WINDSOR CASTLE CHESSMEN

These handsome pieces are true copies of the original Staunton design. The King is about 4 inches high, regulation club size, fitting perfectly a board with 2 -inch squares.
Made of the finest plastic material-practically indestructible -no paint or varnish to chip and peel-the color goes all the way through.
Packed in a handsome wood frame case covered with simulated leather, size $16 \times 101 / 2 \times 21 / 4$ inches. Velvet lined and padded, with felted compartments to hold each piece separately. Has stop hinges, 2 brass catches and handle.


The Gift Supreme The many fine features of the set make it a gift which you will be proud to give and which will give the recipient many hours of enjoyment. It is of breathtaking beauty in either black and ivory or red and ivory, superbly polished, the equal of museum pieces.
The felts are cemented on with a special plastic glue that becomes a part of the piece itself and enters the fibers of the felt to keep it in place as long as the felt lasts.
Of course, most fine sets are weighted to provide good balance, but never before in a manner equal to these pieces. The weights are not just pushed in but are mold. ed right into the pieces.
The design is a true copy of the original Staunton pat. tern. Note the bulk molded into the heads of the pieces, the proper markings on each piece. The set was designed for experts by an expert. And the sets have been enthusiastically received and approved by some of the world's leading players, not only in the United States but abroad as well.
You would expect to have to pay many times the price asked for these outstanding sets. But the price has been held as low as possible consistent with quality in an effort to make the sets available to all.
Conceived and designed by one of America's leading players, the set had to be the best and you will agree that it is.

## Order from

CHESS REVIEW 134 W. 72 St., New York, N. Y. 10023
No. 120-Black \& Ivory, boxed
No. 121-Red \& Ivory, boxed
\$23.75
No. 125-Black \& Ivory, unweighted, cardboard container
No. 126-Red \& Ivory, unweighted, eardboard container

4-1 were made by John Phythyon, Arthur Renna, George Doschek, Robert Walker and Robert Larson.

In Philadelphia the GERA Chess Club of the General Electric Company concluded its first title tourney, which was won by R. Shumski, 5.0 Grouped at 4.1 were C. Smith, C. Stahl and K. Patchel, with Smith taking second on median points.

A match between Bloomsburg State College and Franklin and Marshall College wound $u p$ in a $21 / 2-21 / 2$ standoff. BSC winners were Leonard Thomas and Robert Scott; for F \& M the victors were Ray Goldman and Peter Goodman. On first board, Joe Kressler of BSC drew with F \& M's Ronald Blagg.

The Susquehanna Valley Open, held in Bloomsburg, went to David Daniels, 41/2. $1 / 2$, for the third successive year. Richard Abrams and Edgar T. McCormick matched the winner's game score, but were relegated to second and third respectively on tiebreaks. There was a record entry of 60 .

Vermont. Recently opening its regular intercollegiate chess season, Norwich University started auspiciously with a 7.0 rout of Lyndon State College in a combined student and faculty match. Winners were Prof. Seth C. Hawkins, Rick Passook. hush, Al Brown, Larry Willwerth, Dan Carr, Bill Blackwood and team captain Jake Sartz. Norwich's next victims were

## TOURNAMENT CALENDAR

(Concluded from page 353)
Texas - January 29 to 30
Brownsville Twin Tornado, 2 tournaments, 1 each day at Stillman Town Hall, Fort Brown Civic Center, Brownsville, Texas: 4 Rd SS Tmt, 30 moves/hour: EF $\$ 4$ per tournament, $\$ 7$ for two, \& USCF dues: register by 9 Am , both days: $\$ \$$ as EFs permit, also trophies for 1 st \& 2 d in combined scores and 1 st in A, B, C and unrated \& to over-all champion 2-day accommodations for 2 people at fabulous Sea Island Motel on So. Padre Island: EFs \& inquiries to J. D. Taylor, 2408 E. Washington, Harlingen, Texas.
Texas - February 18 to 20
7th annual El Paso Open at Desert Hills Motel: 6 Rd SS Tmt; 3 Rd, 19th, $1,18 \mathrm{th} \& 2,20$ th, starts $7 \mathrm{pm}, 18 \mathrm{th}: \mathrm{EF}$ $\$ 10$ plus USCF dues: 1st prize $\$ 150$ \& trophy, others and trophies in various classes: inquiries to H. Fabela, 5904 Delta Dr., El Paso, Texas 79905.

## Connecticut - February 22

Hartiord 30-30 Open at YMCA, 315 Pearl St., Hartford, Conn: 6 Rd SS Tmt, 30 moves $/ 30$ minutes: EF $\$ 3$ till Feb. 12, S4 after: starts 10 Am: EFs \& inquiries to F. Townsend, 10 Bermuda Rd., Wethersfield, Comn. 06109.


How seriously Bled took its hosting of the (Bracket B) Challengers Round Matches may be judged by this poster, sent us by Dr. Petar Trifunovich
St. Anselm's College representatives, who lost by $11 / 2 \cdot 31 / 2$. Here Cadets Bill Blackwood and Larry Willwerth again won for Norwich, while A. Cote held the fort for St. Anselm's. First board saw Cadet Dan Carr drawing with St. Anselm's Rod MacDonald.

W'isconsin. Doings at Hawthorn Glen: Gregory Nowak captured the Fall Championship with five straight wins and Henry Meifert took a $30 / 30$ event with 6-1. In the Championship, Joseph Lynch, Charles Adashek and Joseph Chobot placed second, third and fourth respectively on tiebreak points after each had posted 4.1 in games. Twenty-seven players were drawn to the title tourney.

WANTED used 3 dimensional chess set. Send information to L. Cancell, c/o Lenox Lanes, 146 W. 146 St., New York, N. Y. 10039 - or phone: FO-8.9200

## CHESS and CHECKERS Supplies

High Quality Catalin and Plastic Checkers
Plain or Grooved. . All Sizes
CHESS Sets . . . Wood . . Catalln . . Plastic All Sizes . . All Prices
CHESS and CHECKER Boards
Folding, Non-Folding, Regulation or Numbered
CHESS.CHECKER Timing Clocks All Merchandise Reasonably Priced SEND FOR FREE CATALOG
STARR SPECIALTY COMPANY
1529 South Noble Road,
Cleveland Helghts, Ohlo 44121

## MASTER <br> 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 $\$ 11.00$
Genuine Mahogany Square
Model M. Straight board $\$ 11.00$
Model M-F Folding board $\$ 13.00$
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.


No. 1
You are White


How do you best win on A 1 , . . Q-B6? B 1 . . . R-B6? C 1 . . . RxRP? No. 2 You are Black


How do you best win on D 1 Q-K2? E 1 Q-KB5? F 1 Q-QB5?
No. 3
You are White


How do you best win on G $1 \ldots$ P-B6? H $1 \ldots$ NxB? I $1 \ldots$ R-N3?
No. 4 You are Black


How do you best win on J 1 N-B4? K 1 B-B5 ? L 1 RxP? or M 1 P-N8(Q) ? Solutions on page 384.

## CANADA

## Alberta

Eric Long won the Alberta Open with a clear first of $5 \frac{1}{2}-1 / 2$, followed by J. Kassay-Farkas, $41 / 2-11 / 2$. W. Cairns and A. DeJong scored $4-2$ each, with Cairns placing third on a tiebreak.

## Quebec

In the forty-eight-man provincial championship, G. Lantos and L. Witt, each 5-1, divided first and second prizes. Lantos, however, received the nod on a slight edge in the tiebreak. Players scoring $41 / 2-1 / 2$ were T. Ackerman, R. Rubin, I. Zalys, E. Leimanis, P. Haley, J. Rubin and J. Labelle.

## FOREIGN

## Belgium

Although van Seters, $81 / 2 \cdot 21 / 2$, finished first in the Belgian Championship, the runnerup Boey, $71 / 2-31 / 2$, was declared national titleholder because van Seters is not a Belgian citizen.

## International Grandmassers

We are often asked to list the imernational Grandmasters. Here is the official listing as of now. V. Hort (Czech) 1965 is unofficially listed as he qualified by tying for first (with Keres) at Marienbad this summer (we almost said "last year"). Dates indicate year of earning title according to the F.I.D.E.
V. Antoshin (USSR) 1964
Y. Averbakh (USSR) 1952
G. Barcza (Hungary) 1954
P. Benko (USA) 1958
I. Bilek (Hungary) 1962
A. B. Bisguier (USA) 1957
M. Bobotzoy (Bulgaria) 1961
I. Boleslavsky (USSR) 1950
I. Bondarevsky (USSR) 1950
M. Botvinnik (USSR) 1950
D. Bronstein (USSR) 1950
R. Byrne (USA) 1964
M. Damjanovich (Yugo.) 1964
K. Darga (W. Ger.) 1964
J. H, Donner (Neth.) 1959
E. Eliskasis (Argent.) 1952
M. Euwe (Neth.) 1950
L. Evans (USA) 1957
R. Fine (USA) 1950
M. Filip (Czech.) 1955
R. J. Fischer (USA) 1958
S. Flohr (USSR) 1950
Y. Geller (USSR) 1952
S. Gligorich (Yugo.) 1951
C. Guimard (Argent.) 1960
I. Kashdan (USA) 1954
P. Keres (USSR) 1950
V. Korchnoy (USSR) 1956
A. Kotov (USSR) 1950
M. Krogius (USSR) 1964

## England

Peter N. Lee, who at twenty-one is the "youngest British champion ever," according to British chess publications, won the national title in a field of 34 with a clear first of $81 / 2-21 / 2$, ahead of J. Penrose and N. Littlewood, 8-3 each. The British women's championship went to Mrs. E. Pritchard.

At the Paignton Congress, W. R. Hartston came in first with a $5-2$ tally. P. H. Clarke, P. C. Gibbs and A. Toothill shared second, third and fourth prizes.

## Germany

The sixty-four-year-old veteran, Karl Gilg, won the Bavarian championship two full points in front of his nearest rival, Kieninger,

## Soviet Union

The Moscow title was bagged by Aronin, $101 / 2-41 / 2$, one point ahead of Ignatiev.

## Switzerland

A playoff between Marcus and Walther for the Swiss championship was won by Marcus, $21 / 2-11 / 2$.
R. Kholmov (USSR) 1960
B. Larsen (Den.) 1956
L. Lengyel (Hungary) 1964
A. Lilienthal (USSR) 1950
W. Lombardy (USA) 1960
A. Matanovich (Yugo.) 1955
M. Najdorf (Argent.) 1950
A. O'Kelly (Belgium) 1956
F. Olafssen (Iceland) 1958
L. Pachman (Czech.) 1954
N. Padevsky (Bulgaria) 1964
O. Panno (Argent.) 1955
B. Parma (Yugo.) 1963
T. Petrosyan (USSR) 1952
H. Pilnick (Argent.) 1952
V. Pirc (Yugo.) 1953
L. Polugayevsky (USSR) 1962
A. Pomar (Spain) 1962
L. Portisch (Hungary) 1961
S. Reshevsky (USA) 1950
K. Robatsch (Austria) 1961
H. Rossetto (Argent.) 1960
N. Rossolimo (USA) 1953
L. Schmid (W. Ger.) 1959
V. Simagin (USSR) 1962
V. Smyslov (USSR) 1950
B. Spassky (USSR) 1955
L. Szabo (Hungary) 1950
M. Taimanov (USSR) 1957
M. Tahl (USSR) 1957
G. Stahlberg (Sweden) 1950
L. Stein (USSR) 1962
A. Tolusch (USSR) 1953
G. Tringov (Bulgaria) 1963
P. Trifunovich (Yugo.) 1953
M. Udovehich (Yugo.) 1962
W. Uhlmann (E. Ger.) 1959
W. Unzicker (W. Ger.) 1954
A. Yanovsky (Canada) 1964
E. Vasyukov (USSR) 1961

# AS ANALYZED IN THE U.S.S.R. 

## The World Champion Speaks

GAME 7, TAHL-PORTISCH MATCH
(Analyzed by Tigran Petrosyan)
In the seventh game of the world title elimination match between Mikhail Tahl of the USSR and Lajos Portisch of Hungary, the latter, playing White, failed in all his efforts to gain something by simple means, It was Tahl who seized the advantage shortly after the end of the opening stage and gradually increased it with strong moves which outwardly did not look so effective.

NIMZO-INDIAN DEFENSE

| L. Portisch |  | M. Tahl |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hungary |  | Soviet Union |  |  |
| White |  |  |  | Black |
| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | N-KB3 | 5 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | P-B4 |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB4}$ | P-K3 | 6 | B-K2 | P-Q4 |
| 3 N-QB3 | B-N5 | 7 | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | P×QP |
| 4 P-K3 | O-O | 8 | KP×P | N-QB3 |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 5$ | B-K2 |


$10 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$
This is a typical moment. Play becomes strategically acute after $10 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$. Portisch hopes to force his rival, after 10 ... Pxp, to acquiesce to a position in which White will have an isolani. It is a position with which he is quite familiar and which he has often successfully applied.

$$
10 \ldots
$$

P-QN3
Now, with stereotyped continuations, White has little chance of retaining the initiative into the middle game. His plan of action, therefore, is rarely resorted to and actually promises no real advantage.
$\begin{array}{lrlr}11 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N} & \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B} & 14 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Q} 1 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3 \\ 12 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} & \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} & 15 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 3 & \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1 \\ 13 \text { Q-R4 } & \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 2 & 16 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 1 & \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 4\end{array}$
Manifestly, after this move, White has to think about preserving an equal game.

| 17 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 1$ | $21 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN4}$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| $18 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $22 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 5$ | $\mathrm{~B} \times N$ ! |  |
| $19 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 5$ | $23 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ |  |
| 20 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | $24 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 4$ |

Ivory chess set - Staunton design only - no ornate. London made of African Ivory. Send 50 c for pictures and prizes. George Wentz, Box 626, San Marcos, Texas 78666


25 P-B4
White's game has been deteriorating, and he makes a desperate effort to turn the tide.

Probably, Portisch had too little time to figure and be convinced that the variants after $25 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3$, NxKP were acceptable: e.g. $26 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ [worse is 26 QxN , QxQ $27 \mathrm{RxQ}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 828 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ or $28 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 6], \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 6 \dagger 27 \mathrm{QxN}, \mathrm{BxQ}$ $28 \mathrm{PxQ}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 8 \quad 29 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$, RxN [29 . . BxN 30 B-K3] $30 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 8 \stackrel{4}{4}, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 231$ $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{RxB}+32 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2$ !
$\begin{array}{llllr}25 \ldots & \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{BP} & 28 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} \dagger & \mathrm{B}+\mathrm{P} \\ 26 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 6 & \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 4 & 29 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 3 & \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 4 \\ 27 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1 & \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 4 & 30 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4 & \ldots .\end{array}$
Now White loses another Pawn. But that is insignificant as his position is quite somber.

| 30 | B-Q4 | 36 | Q-K4 | R-Q1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 31 B-K4 | BxP | 37 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4$ | Q-N6 |
| 32 PxP | B-B5 | 38 | Q-N7 $\dagger$ | R-Q2 |
| 33 Q-QB2 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | 39 | Q-B8 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB2}$ |
| $34 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 5 \dagger$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | 40 | $R \times R+$ | $K \times R$ |
| 35 BxB | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ | 41 | Q-B7 $\dagger$ |  |

The game was adjourned here, and White resigned without resuming play. Tahl played this game simply and well.

## The Soviet Champion Speaks <br> VAN DEN BERG vs KORCHNOY (Analyzed by Korchnoy)

There were highly interesting, complicated moments in this game in the European Team Championships in Hamburg. The Soviet title-holder comments on the game.

NIMZO-INDIAN DEFENSE

| C. B. van den Berg <br> Holland |  | V. Korchnoy <br> Soviet Union |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| White |  |  |  |

After $15 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3$, White has real chances of developing an attack, but his advantage is erased by this premature thrust of his Bishop Pawn.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
15 \cdots \\
16 \text { Q-R4 } 4 & N-B 3!
\end{array}
$$

Courtesy of Novosti Press Agency-APN

The correct reply is $16 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5$.


Now, with 16 . . P-B5 17 NxN, Q-K1, Black could have obtained material advantage, but he is carried away by another idea. Play becomes very sharp.

| $17 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{N}$ | QxP† | $20 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{N}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $18 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ | QxB | $21 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4$ | $\mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{K} 1$ |
| $19 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $22 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}!$ | $\ldots .$. |

In preliminary calculations, Black considered $22 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 5$ which he would have met by $22 \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{KB1} 23 \mathrm{BxP}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 6$ !
$22 \ldots$.
$B \times N$
White answers 22 . . . $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 5$ by 26 Q-B6!

## 23 B-R6!

Again, the best move. 23 B -B6 loses to 23 . . $R-K 5$. Also, Black gains a winning position on $23 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 524$ $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 5 \dagger, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 125 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 6 \dagger, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 226 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{K} 1$, K-Q2: $27 \mathrm{RxQ}, \mathrm{RxR}$.


24 B-B4?
The decisive error. On $2: \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{K} 1$, Black is obliged to return his piece with $24 .$. QxPi, and both sides then have equal chances.

$$
24 \ldots \quad B-K 2!
$$

White had overlooked this reply.

| 25 | Q-R5 | Q-B3 | 27 | B-R6 |  | B-Q3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 26 | R-QB3 | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ ! | 28 | R-KR3 |  | XBP! |
|  |  |  |  | Resigns |  |  |

$\dagger=$ check $; \ddagger=$ dbl. check: $\S=$ dis. ch.
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# Matches Toward The World Championship The Tahl-Larsen Semi-finals at Bled 1965 

By Dr. PETAR TRIFUNOVICH

In match play, being White in the first game does matter. Though he who is Black will be White in the last game, that is only if he lasts till then. So the good old Vienna practice was invoked for the pairings. Arbiter Dr. Dorazil placed two wrapped bolles of brandy before the duelists; and, as Tahl chose the one with the dark contents, he started as Black.
The match, set for July lst, had to be postponed two days as Tahl declared he had developed a blister on his foot from table tennis. To many, including the narrator, the reasoning seemed unclear. For foothall, yes-but could one simple blister prevent one from playing chess? The agitated spirits were soon allayed: "I is well known that, during a game, Tahl likes to fly around his victim as a condor around his prey. "He cannot do so with an injured foot and so would be seriously handicapped." Understood; no objection.
Though Larsen eliminated his famous rival Ivkov quite easily, few supposed an equal battle would ensue here. But Larsen proved an absolutely equal partner wilh his great opponent regarding tactics-in which Tahl had been thought peerless. In Game 1 against the King's Indian, Larsen applied a line of grandmaster Benko, very hazardous but little known and untested. Tahl missed the correct continuation and lost much time in thinking. He elected to take a Pawn; but, while he did, Larsen penetrated on the Queenside and adjourned with a winning game.
Game 2 was avidly anticipated, espe. cially to see how Larsen would defend versus Tall's 1 P-K4, a problem not solved by Portisch in Tahl's prior match. Larsen chose the Spanish Game, an old and a bit passive system of Steinitz' Defense. When he could easily have played, in different ways, to draw, he committed two serious oversights and Tahl guillotined his rival with mathematical precision.
Tahl then led with one game adjourned, but he resigned that without playing.
In Game 3, against Larsen's Catalan System, Tahl evoked the Benoni and very early . . . P-QN4, in theory a dubious move for Black. Larsen could not find a weak point, then missed an attacking chance offered neediessly by Tahl and found himself in a poor endgame. Larsen's precise defense barely held off Tahl's efforts.
Great courage is needed to employ the Alekhine Defense against an attacker like Tahl. But Larsen did it in Game 4. Dubi-
ous-but the game justified him. Tahl was manifestly taken by surprise. Then he lost a good deal of time calculating a very complicated sacrifice and finally abstained. Already a psychological advanlage for Larsen. A bit tired and with the game not developing to his taste, Tahl continued inexactly with a Pawn sacrifice when already in a bad position. Larsen easily shook off his attempts to complicate and adjourned in a Rook endgame unanimously judged a win for him. Incredibly, however, he juggled an elementary win, needing no analysis, into a draw.

In four games, Larsen looked, surpris. ingly, the better, except for uncertainty in profiting from his advantages.

In Game 5, Larsen cunningly tried an old continuation compelling Black to quiet and patient play for a draw. Tahl attempted to complicate and already could have resigned by move 25, the Exchange down without compensation but he resisted till move 50.
So the situation became critical for Tahl as Larsen led for the second time, and Tahl could not afford another defeat.
Larsen appeared unable, however, to profit from the circumstances and require Tahl to try to force the game in simple positions. For Game 6, he again chose the Alekhine, and when Tahl might be expected prepared for it. Tahl was, having analyzed the opening with Ivkov, and surprised Larsen with his sixth move (found during the Ivkov analysis). Tahl took over the initiative, sacrificed ingeniously on move 16 and evened the score.
Game 7 was identical with Game 3 till move 12. Here Larsen could be expected to have an improvement. On the contrary, he soon had a poor position. Tahl made an extraordinary sacrifice and ultimately won the Exchange. The game looked like an easy win, and Tahl said so. But it proved to be an exceptional draw.
Game 8 was the least interesting of the match. Though White, Tahl was not fit for battle. He might have had a sleepless night searching for a win in Game 7. So Tahl, the sworn enemy of the Sicilian, did not perform bellicosely against that opening.
Now the match neared its end, the situation was unresolved and the nervous tension of both players was at a culmination. Till now, all wins were by White. Larsen had to play to win in Game 9; he knew Tahl would in the last game. Larsen selected an incorrect plan against the King's Indian, yielding the initiative to

Tahl. Tahl continued in a risky way, then made an error, returning the advantage to Larsen. Then, short of time, Tahl lapsed into a lost endgame. But the miracle happened again, and Larsen analyzed poorly, overlooked a problem move and ended drawing.
No one believed any longer in a victory for Larsen. He had, it's the general inapression, enough chances which he let go too easily. So all believed Tahl's "five minutes" had come. Larsen himself was worried and indisposed. Tahl was very fit for battle against Larsen's Sicilian in Game 10. He found occasion for a very complicated and courageous sacrifice of a Knight. It is difficult to say if it was correct or not, or what might follow. But Larsen came out two Pawns down and short of time.
So the score became $51 / 2-41 / 2$ for Tahl.
The course of this match refuted the prevailing opinion (beforehand) that, in tactics, Tahl was peerless and Larsen unable to oppose him. Tahl did demonstrate he is beyond Larsen in creation of ingenious combinations, but Larsen opposed him successfully and imposed his own conceptions on the former World Champion. He proved a worthy opponent, and the result could easily have turned to his favor. He started sure of his strength, but he would have done better to have brought along a good second. In that event, he would have won the adjourned positions in Games 3 and 9.
It is interesting to note that all wins were by White. Tahl played 1 P-K4 as though obligatorily, and the impression remains that Larsen did not have a sure defense. On the other hand, Tahl was not well prepared against Larsen's 1 P-Q4 and, as in Games 1 and 5, often incurred an inferior position even in the opening.

Tahl's match with Spassky is scheduled from October 31 to November 18 in Thilisi [Tiflis], lasting 12 games, with a sudden death playoff of four games, and a coin toss if the match is still tied.
Tahl liquidated his rivals at Bled, but the real job and the real opponent awaits him now. To succeed, Tahl must play much better than in his previous two matches.
This final match between Spassky and Tahl represents a great attraction for the amateurs of chess. The system of matches to determine the Challenger for the World Championship has justified its existence. The earlier obstacles and remarks cannot
be taken longer into account. The way to the summit is secure for the strongest player.

## Game 1

## KING'S INDIAN DEFENSE



One must be acquainted with finesses such as this last move. $10 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ allows Black an even game by $10 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KBA}$ 11 PxP, PxP.


11 P-KN4
This paradoxical but logical move was patented by Benko in his game against Pachman in the Interzonal at Portoroz 1958.

After 11 N -Q3, P-B5, Black, as practice has often confirmed, gets counter chances against White's King by . . . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 4-5$. The text blocks off that attack while it is still embryonic and, if successful, therefore, enhances White's Queenside chances.

## 11... P-KR4

Though this position has come up often, theory doesn't indicate Black's best move. The text is from Wade-Reshevsky, Buenos Aires 1960 . It cannot be recommended. A better line is in Bilek-Stein, Interzonal at Stockholm 1962: 11 . . K-R1 $12 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 2, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ $13 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 414 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 1, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 215 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$, $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$ with approximately even chances. 12 P-N5
12 PxRP, P-B5 was bad for White in Velimirovich-Minich, Belgrade 1960.

$$
12 \ldots
$$

$$
P-R 5
$$

Black follows Reshevsky's scheme, his one good chance, to play to win the Knight Pawn, preparing for . . . P-B5 and for posting Rook at KR4 and Knight at KR2.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 13 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 3 \\
& 14 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1 \text { ! }
\end{aligned}
$$

P-B5

Wade had played $14 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 1$ and soon had a lost position. Larsen must be well acquainted with that game. He improves on it. Posting his King safely saves him an important tempo later and foxily lets Black press on with his program, expecting to utilize the exposed position of Black's King.


Tahl analyzing during play is quite a sight. The sparkle of ideas seems to contort him. And, in addition, he is very likely to be surrounded by admiring fans -especially youthful ones. And Tahl is quite content about that.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
14 \ldots \ldots & K-B 2 \\
15 & \ldots-B 5
\end{array}
$$

By this sacrifice, White opens the Queenside and begins operations there.

$$
15 \ldots \quad \text { R-R1 }
$$

Black can do no better than follow his program. Accepting the sacrifice leads to a strong initiative for White after 15 . . . NxP 16 NxN, PxN 17 $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 3, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 118 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ [18 B-N5 $\dagger$ also is good] as Black must prevent both 19 $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ and $19 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5$. Hence $18 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ 19 Q-R3! with White's initiative growing.

## 16 Q-N3

Tahl himself has since recommended 16 PxP, PxP 12 NxP! PxN 18 BxP, B-K4 19 B-K3 with threat of $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4-5$ etc.

$$
16 \ldots \quad \text { P-N3 }
$$

This is a necessary defense against $17 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6$.

| 17 P $\times$ QP | P×P |
| :--- | ---: |
| 18 Q-R3 | N-QB4 |

Again, Black's reply is forced; for 18 . . N-B1 is met by $19 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5$.

$$
19 \mathrm{NxN}
$$

$$
N P \times N
$$

$$
20 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 4
$$

. . . .

Now White is master of the Queenside.

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
20 . \text { Q×NP } & \text { P×P } \\
21 \text { B-R6 }
\end{array}
$$

Black's last is motivated more by defense than attack, defense for his Queen Pawn as against $22 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5$.

| 22 | R-KN1 | R-QN1 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 23 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5$ | N -B1 |

Not $23 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 324 \mathrm{NxP} \uparrow$. $\begin{array}{lll}24 & \text { B-R3 } & \text { B-B1 } \\ 25 & \text { Q-B4 } & \text { B-K2 }\end{array}$

26 Q-B7!
White looks ahead to occupying K6 with his Knight.

| 28 |  | Q×Q |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 29 | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{Q}$ | R-R4 |
| 30 | B-KB1 | BxB |

28 . . . B-Q2 $29 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 6, \mathrm{BxN} 30 \mathrm{PxB} \uparrow$, KxP $31 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3 \dagger, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 232$ QR-QB1, N-N3 $33 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7$ is hopeless for Black.

$33 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$ is correct.


Black ought to play 33 . . . P-R6 as he then has counter chances with . . . P-N4-5. Tahl, laboring under the impression of a variation with 33 . . . $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 334 \mathrm{NxP}$, PxN $35 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2 \dagger, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 236$ $\mathrm{BxR}, \mathrm{RxB} 37 \mathrm{RxP}$, thought he had to protect his KB5. Now, after White's next, Black's Kingside is blocked and he has only waiting moves.

| 34 | P-R3! | R-N1 | 38 | K-K2 | R-N1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 35 | R/7-B6 | K-B2 | 39 | K-Q3 | R-KR1 |
| 36 | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | K-B3 | 40 | R-B7 | N3 |
| 37 | K-B1 | R-KR1 | 41 | R/1-B6 |  |

The threat is 42 RxB and $43 \mathrm{BxP} \uparrow$.

## 41 . . . . <br> KR-QB1

This was the sealed move. 41 . . . $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 1$ is met by $42 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 5$ ! with threats of $43 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 7 \dagger$ and $43 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 7$.

## Resigns

42 BxP is decisive.

Game 4
ALEKHINE DEFENSE
M. Tahl
B. Larsen

1 P-K4 N-KB3
Against an aggressive player like Tahl, it is not reasonable to adopt the Alekhine. It offers fertile ground for his fecund imagination and is the source of numerous attacking possibilities. The course of this game does not change this opinion; one adds only that the stars were against Tahl, this once.

| 2 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q4}$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 3 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| 4 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |

The move merits a question mark: it is a novelty of a sort by Larsen but bad as it aids the development of White's pieces.

5 NxP
N-Q2
In Games 6 and 8, for reasons best understood from the comment immediately following, Larsen played 5

[^0]P-K3. For Game 6, see comments there. As for 8, Larsen also achieved a dubious position after $6 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5, \mathrm{P}$-KN3 7 Q-B3.


6 B-QB4
Certain loose talk of how Tahl always makes a sacrifice unless he can see a definite refutation can end here. He studied 6 NxP and its consequences for 45 minutes and could not decide on it.

It must be confessed that the correct conlinuation is extremely difficult to work out. Most commentators and many analyses after the game resorted to the generality that later analysis will prove the point. In this writer's opinion the sacrifice is correct and may lead to 7 NxP! KxN 8 Q-R5t, K-K3 9 P-QB4, N/4-B3 [9 , . . N-N5 $10 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3!\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 7+$ $11 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 1$, NxR $12 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 5 \dagger, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 313 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5{ }^{*}$ and $14 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 34$ ete.] $10 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5 \uparrow, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 311$ Q-B7!! [the key move: the threats are 12 Q-K6 $\dagger$ and $12 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4 \dagger \mathrm{j}$, and the fol. lowing:
a) $11 \ldots \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} \cdot 12$


B-B4, Q-K1 [or . . . P-QN3 $13 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B3}$, $\mathrm{P}-$ QK3 14 P-QN4 with threat of $15 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$ t etc.] $13 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5 \dagger, \mathrm{KxP}$ $14 \mathrm{QxQ}, \mathrm{NXQ} 15 \mathrm{BxN}$, KxP $16 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ ! with threat of $17 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3 \dagger$. White has a decisive advantage in development worth more than one Pawn;
b) $11 \ldots \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 312 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4 \dagger, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 213$ N-B3, Q-K1 14 Q-K64, K-Q1 15 Q-K5, Q-Q2 16 O-O-O, and Black has no good defense against $17 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B5}$;
c) 11 . . N-B4 $12 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 4, \mathrm{~N} / 4-\mathrm{K} 5$ 13 P-B3 etc.
$6 \ldots$
P-K3
7 Q-N4
....

White acts prematurely and can make no profit. $7 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ is better.

$$
7 \ldots \quad \text { P-KR4 }
$$

An audacious answer: it is justified in the following line wherein White's Queen tries to remain on the Knight file: 7 Q-N $3, P-R 58$ Q-N4, NxN 9 PxN, B-Q2 $10 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{KN} 5$ ? B-K2 $11 \mathrm{BxB}, \mathrm{QxB} 12$ QxNP, O-O-O, with a winning position for Black.

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

Now Black has no problems: he prepares $B-B 3$ and also to castle long. 10 0-0
White does better and gets an even game by 10 N-Q2, B-B3 $11 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 10 . . . \\
& 11 \text { R-Q1 } \\
& \text { B-B3 } \\
& \text { Q-K2! } \\
& \text { Now } 12 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 2 \text { is met by } 12 \text {. . . N-B5. } \\
& 12 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3 \\
& \text { Needlessly, White lets his Pawn for- } \\
& \text { mation be smashed. He ought to simplify } \\
& \text { by } 12 \mathrm{~B} \text {-QN5, BxB } 13 \text { QxBt, P-QB3 } 14 \\
& \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2 \text {, preparing for } \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4 \text {. }
\end{aligned}
$$

This innocent-looking move hides a devilish trick: 16 BxRP! PxB 17 QxQRP, and 17 . . . B-K5 18 QxRt, BxQ 19 R-N8! or 17 . . Q Q-B4 18 QxR! BxQ $19 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 8 \dagger, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 220 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5 \dagger$ etc.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
15 \ldots & Q-B 4 \\
16 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3 & \ldots .
\end{array}
$$

This Pawn sacrifice gains only a momentary initiative. $16 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ ! $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 217$ P-B4, O-O 18 B-K3, and White need not lose this position.

| 16 | Q | QxP | 18 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 17 | B-Q3 | Q-N5 |  |
| P-B4 | Q-KB4 | 19 Q-B2 | B-K2 |

On 19 . . . B-N2 20 P-R3, Black's Queen is trapped.

## 20 B-Q4

White misses his last chance. On 20 B-K2, Q-R5 [or $20 \ldots$ Q-B4 $21 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ ] $21 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 622 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$, White gets the same position as in the game but with two tempi more. The difference is remarkable.

| 20 | O-0 | 24 | P-N3 | Q-R6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21 B-K2 | Q-B4 | 25 | B-B3 | QR-Q1 |
| 22 B-Q3 | Q-N5 | 26 | BxB | PxB |
| 23 B-K2 | Q-R5 | 27 | B-K5 | Q-B4 |

Black's Queen gets back into play. On 28 BxP? Black has 28 . . . B-B4.

$$
28 \text { Q-K2 B-Q3! }
$$

As White has weak points on both sides, Black can operate with counter threats, disregarding his own weak Pawns.
29 R-Q3

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B} & 31 & \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R} \\
\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} & 32 & \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1 \\
33 & 33-\mathrm{B} 4
\end{array}
$$

R-Q1
$30 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} \quad \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} \quad 32 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1 \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B4}$

If white allows $33 \ldots$ R-Q4, Black wins easily after $34 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$, PxP 35 PxP , P-B4! 36 PxP, RxBP.

$$
33 \ldots \quad \text { Q-N5! }
$$

The Rook ending is an easy win for Black, and White cannot avoid exchanging Queens because of $34 \ldots \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q5}(\mathrm{t})$.

| 34 | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Q}$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 35 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 1$ |

Black has difficulties after 35 K-N2 $36 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 437 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QN} 1$ !

36 R-Q2
$\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 2$
Here Black begins a series of minor inaccuracies. After the simple 36 . R-N5 $37 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 438 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 2, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 439$ $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 240 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 341 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 4$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 3$, any White move loses material.

37 K-K3
P-N4
$\dagger=$ check; $\ddagger=$ dbl. check; $\%=$ dis. ch.

## Game 6 <br> ALEKHINE DEFENSE <br> 17. . K-B1 18 Q-K8 is mate. 18 P-QB4 <br> QXKP

| M. Tah1 |  | B. Larsen |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| White |  |  | Black |
| 1 P-K4 | N-KB3 | 3 P-Q4 | P-Q3 |
| 2 P-K5 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q4}$ | $4 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB3}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ ? |
|  |  | $5 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K3}$ |

Now Black avoids 5. . . N-Q2.
6 Q-B3!
Here is the answer found by Ivkov and Tahl in analysis together. Ivkov con. tinued $6 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KN} 37 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2$ and later analysis confirmed that 6 Q-R5 donated an important tempo for Black's fianchettoing.

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
6 \ldots \text { M } \\
7 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 3 & \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3 \\
\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3
\end{array}
$$

Black has to lose this tempo on account of the threat of $8 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{KN} 5$,

$$
8 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 3
$$

$8 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ and $9 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 4$ seems worthwhile.

8 $\qquad$ N-N5
This may be the only satisfactory line. 8 . . NxN 9 PxN, B-Q3 10 P-KB4 followed by $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ and $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ gives White a formidable attacking position.

| 9 | B-N5 $\dagger$ | P-B3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 10 | B-R4 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| 11 | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\cdots$ |

$11 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 4$ fails against $11 \ldots \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 4$.

| 11 | $\times \mathrm{N}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 12 PxN | Q-N |

Black threatens White's Queen Bishop Pawn actually meaning to induce $Q x Q$.

13 Q-B3
Q-B4
13 . . . NxBP is met by $14 \mathrm{BxP}+$ ! So Black prepares . . . B-K2, 13 . . B-K2 runs into $14 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 415 \mathrm{NxN}, \mathrm{PxN}$ 16 QxQP! P-QN4 16 BxNP, B-Q2 17 Q-B3.
14 Q-K2
B-K2
15 P-QR3
....

Tahl's second, master Koblenz, has pointed out that here the solid positional plan of $45 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ followed by $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 4$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ and $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 2$ is better.

$$
15 \ldots \quad \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 4
$$


$16 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5$
A pretty and surprising move, typical of Tahl's style but more impressive than effective.

16

## PxN

The present cannot be refused: e.g. 16 . . . O-O $17 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 4, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 318 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$, $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 319 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$, and Black can resign. 17 QxP $\dagger$

K-Q1

Why give back the piece in this way? Much better is 18 . . N-N3 19 Q-R5, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 220 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 121 \mathrm{PxN}, 22 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 5$, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q1}$ ! with threat of 23 . . . B-Q2 and all pieces actively placed. Master Koblenz' plan now appears correct (see note to move 15),
After 18 . . . N-B5, Tahl intended: $1.9 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1 \dagger$, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 220 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 7 \dagger$, $\mathrm{BxR} 21 \mathrm{QxB}+$, K-N1 22 QxB, QxP $23 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 324$ QxBP, Q-B3 25 B-K8! Q-K2 [or $25 \ldots$ $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 426 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4] 26 \mathrm{QxN}, \mathrm{RxB} 27 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 5$ ! $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 228 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 6+!\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 129 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$ with a positionally won game.
19 PxN
B-Q3
21 Q-K2
QXQP

Now Black is defenseless. His Pawn plus means nothing in the face of the open Queen and Queen Bishop files for White's Rooks, Black's King exposed and his Rooks undeveloped.

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
21 . K & K-K 2 \\
22 \text { KR-Q1 } & \text { Q-QR4 }
\end{array}
$$

$22 \ldots$ Q-K4 is met by 23 Q-B2 with threat of $24 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$.
23 Q-N4!
Q-KB4
23... R-Q1 permits a deciding sacrifice: 24 QxNP ! QxB 25 BxP followed by $26 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5 \dagger$. 24 Q-QB4 Q-QB4
Or 24 . . . R-Q1 25 B-K3 etc. $\begin{array}{lll}25 \text { Q-Q3 } & \text { Q-Q4 } \\ 26 \text { Q-QB3 } & \text { B-K4 }\end{array}$
Now Black cannot repeat moves with 26 . . . Q-QB4 because of $27 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B4}$, P-K4 28 BxKP! or 26 . . . Q-K4 27 B-B4, QxQ $28 \mathrm{BxB} \dagger$ etc.

27 Q-K1!
With this move, White acquires the tempo for developing his Queen Bishop and has no more problems about winning.

| 27. | Q-B4 | 29 | QR-B1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 28 B-Q2! | K-B3 | 30 Q-K3 | Q-R3 |

On $30 \ldots$. . QxP, white has $31 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$. 31 Q-N4
White operates with little threats, e.g. here $32 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{QN} 5$.

31 | B-QN4 |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| 32 | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{NP}$ |
| 33 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |$\quad \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 2$

$\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 1$

Or 33 . . B-B2 $34 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 34$ and 35 B-B6.

34 B-B6 Resigns
Game 7 - An Exceptional Draw


49
R-K1

Tah1 is Black in a game which had appeared a certain win for him. But his ship was wrecked on this cliff.

Black's difficulty is his King position. The King cannot leave the corner very conveniently: e.g. 49 . . . K-R3 50 N -B5 $\dagger$ and 51 NxP. Hence, Black must consent to further simplication and exchange of Queen Pawns.
$\begin{array}{lrlll}50 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 5 & \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 4 & 52 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 4 & \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 3 \\ 51 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{P} & \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P} & 53 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 4 & \ldots .\end{array}$
White has just time to prevent $53 \ldots$ P -B4. This type of ending is little known; and this example serves to enforce the general theory that the win is difficult and exceptional.

| 53 | R-G | R-QR4 | 56 | K-B4 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 54 K-B3 | K-B2 | 57 | K-B3 | K-K4 |
| $55 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3!$ | K-K3 | 58 | N-R5! |  |

Here is the key move. The Knight does its utmost, attacking Black's Pawn and preventing Black's King from approaching. It was a draw in 91 moves.

## Game 9 - Bad Analysis

There was reference in October (page 301) to Larsen's faltering in analysis of adjourned games. Here is a sample.


## 42 R-R4

The first move after adjournment, and Larsen is going wrong. The correct 42 P-R4 fixes both Black Pawns on black squares, and a satisfactory defense for Black seems unascertainable: 42 . . . B-B2 $43 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 5$, K-Q2 [or $43 \ldots \mathrm{~K}$. . Q3 $44 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 5 \dot{\dagger}, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 345 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ and $46 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$ ete.] $44 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 245 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 346$ $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 2$, and White's King decides.

$$
42 \ldots
$$

B-B2
White can still adopt the method just described by $43 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 4$ and $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4$.

| 43 | K-K2? | K-Q2 | 45 | R-R3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 44 K-Q3 | R-N7 | 46 | B-Q2 | $\ldots .$. |

Here $46 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ is correct.
46 ...
B-K2!
47 R-R4
....

Or 47 RxP?? RxB $\dagger$ etc.

## 47 . . . <br> 48 BxB

B-N5!
Virtually forced.

| $48 .$. | P×B |
| :--- | ---: |
| 49 K-B4 | R×BP |
| 50 K-Q5 | $\cdots \cdots$ |

Or $50 \mathrm{KxP}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 350 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 6 \dagger, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 2$ etc. $50 \ldots$ R-QN7! $52 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}$ P-N6 $51 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 7 \mathrm{H} \quad \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 1 \quad 53 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} \quad \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ Now the game is a theoretical draw, but Larsen kept on till move 78 .
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Game 10
The last and deciding game. SICILIAN DEFENSE

| M. Tahl |  |  |  | Larsen |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White |  |  |  | Black |
| 1 P-K4 | P-QB4 | 5 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | P-Q3 |
| $2 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | N-QB3 | 6 | B-K3 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B3}$ |
| 3 P-Q4 | PxP | 7 | P-B4 | B-K2 |
| 4 NxP | P-K3 | 8 | Q-B3 | O-0 |
|  |  | 9 | O-O-O | . . . |

White has demonstrated his inten. tions, sharp position and complications.

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

Here is a small inaccuracy. $9 \ldots$. B-Q2 to finish developing is better.
$10 \mathrm{~N} / 4-\mathrm{N} 5 \quad \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 1 \quad 12 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 4 \quad \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{N}$ 11 P-KN4 P-QR3 $13 \mathrm{BxN} \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 4$
Reasonably, Black refuses to go into $13 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 414 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 5$ and a) $14 \ldots$ PxB 15 PxN, BxP $16 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 5, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 117$ $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$ ! with a positional advantage and strong attack for White or b) $14 \ldots$. B-N5 15 Q-N3, BxR 16 PxN, BxP 17 $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 5!$ PxB 18 NxB $\div, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 119 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 1$ on which White wins.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 14. P-N5 } & \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 2 \\
15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3 & \cdots \cdot
\end{array}
$$

White's intention here is bolder than may be imagined as his next move reveals. A solider and more logical attack, however, lies in $15 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 1$ : e.g. $15 \ldots$. P-N5 16 N-K2, P-K4 17 B-K3, PxP 18 NxP with better play for White.

$$
15 \ldots \quad \text { P-N5 }
$$



16 N -Q5! !
As usual with Tahl, a genial but incorrect sacrifice. He is not content with 16 N-K2, P-K4 17 B-K3, PxP 18 NxP , $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 4$. He wants to tear into his opponent at once.

$$
16 \ldots
$$

## $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{N}$

The offer must be accepted. On 16 ...B-Q1 $17 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 6 \dagger$ ! PxN 18 PxP, the attack on the opened Knight file decides. 17 PxP
The idea is both Bishops shoot at the Black King, and Black's main forces are far off. A very dangerous idea.

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

The position is an electrically charged cloud bringing a storm. In a tornado variation, White sacrifices all pieces: 17 . . . N-B4? 18 BxP $\dagger$ ! KxB 19 Q-R5 $\dagger$, K-N1 20 BxP ! KxB 21 Q-R64, K-N1 22 $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 6$, and White drives his enemy off the board. In a "rich man's variation," Black returns the piece: 17 . . . N-K4 18 PxN, PxP 19 Q-K4, BxP $\dagger 20 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1$, P-B4 21 QxKP, QxQ $22 \mathrm{BxQ}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR4}$, and Black plays a quiet chess ending. In a variation of "an offended gentleman," to prove it is not so easy to hand
him a piece, Black has 17 . . . P-N3! $18 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 4, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 419 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5, \mathrm{NxB} \dagger 20 \mathrm{RxN}$, B-B4 21 PxP, BPxP; for now the combination with 22 RxP, KxR 23 Q-R1广, K-N1 24 Q-R8 $\dagger, K-B 225$ Q-N7t, K-K1 26 R-K3 is hung up by $26 \ldots$ Q-B2!
Larsen's defense loses. 18 QR-K1


White wins on 18 . . . B-Q1 very prettily: 19 Q-R5, N-B4 20 BxNP!! $\mathrm{NxB} \dagger 21 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1$, NxR [or $21 . \ldots \mathrm{NxBP}$ 22 Q-R6 etc.] $22 \mathrm{RxN}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 2$ [or $22 \ldots$. KxB 23 Q-R6 $\dagger$, K-N1 $24 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 6, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 225$ PxP $\dagger$, QxP $26 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 1 \dagger$ etc.] 23 BxR , R-KB2 $24 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 6!\mathrm{PxP} 25 \mathrm{QxP} \dagger!\mathrm{KxB} 26$ $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 6 \dagger, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 227 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 228 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 8 \div$ etc.

$$
19 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 4 \quad \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2
$$

19 ... N-B1 looks better; but, after $20 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5$, Black has no adequate defense against 21 P-N6: e.g. 20 . . . P-N3 21 Q-R3 threatening $22 \mathrm{PxP}, \mathrm{NxP} 23 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 6$ [in turn threatening 24 QxN! PxQ 25 R-R8 mate], N-B1 24 P-N6! etc. And, on 19 . . . N-B4 20 P-R5, NxB广 21 QxN, B-B1 22 P-N6, R-K2 23 RxR , BxR 24 PxPt, KxP 25 Q-N3 followed by 26 Q-N6 $\dagger$ and 27 P-R6.

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
20 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{BP} & \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B} \\
21 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B} & \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 4
\end{array}
$$

Tahl is ready to solve in his unique style 21 . . . R-B2 $22 \mathrm{RxR}, \mathrm{KxR}$ by 23 P-N6†! PxP 24 P-R5, N-B3 25 PxP $\dagger$, $\mathrm{KxP} 26 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 1 \div, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 227 \mathrm{BxN}!\mathrm{KxB} 28$ Q-N4! winning.

$$
\begin{array}{llr}
22 \text { Q-K4 } & \text { Q-KB1 } \\
23 \text { P×N } & \text { R-B5 } \\
24 \text { Q-K3 } & R-B 6
\end{array}
$$

O 24
Q-QN3!

$$
25 \text { Q-K2 }
$$

$Q \times R$
Or 25 . . . BxP $26 \mathrm{PxP}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 5 \dagger 27$ Q-Q2 etc.

| 26 QxR | PxP |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 27 | R-K1 | R-Q1 |
| 28 | RxP | $\cdots .$. |

The game is decided: White has two Pawns plus in a good position. Larsen can pack for Copenhagen, and Tahl is step by step approaching the chess crown. But the next step is more diffi. cult; in Spassky, he has a tougher opponent than Portisch and Larsen.
$27 \ldots$
Q-Q3
28 Q-B4 R-B1

Not 28 . . . BxP? 29 R-Q8 $\ddagger$ etc.

| 29 | Q-K4 | P-N6 | 33 | B-B5! | QxB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 30 | RPXP | R-B8 $\dagger$ | 34 | R-K8 $\dagger$ | R-B1 |
| 31 | K-Q2 | Q-N5 $\dagger$ | 35 | Q-K6 $\dagger$ | K-R1 |
| 32 | P-B3 | Q-Q3 | 36 | Q-B7! | Resigns |

WORLD CHAMPIONSHIP CHALLENGERS ROUND -- 1956

SEMI-FINALS-Bracket B, Bled, Yugoslavia

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Totals | W D L |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Mikhail Tahl | 0 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | 1 | $51 / 2-41 / 2$ | 3 | 5 |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Game $1^{\text {² }}$ KING'S INDIAN DEFENSE White: Larsen

Black: Tahl
RUY LOPEZ Black: Larsen 1 P-K4, P-K4 2 N-KB3, N-QB3 3 B-N5, N -B3 $4 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 35 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 26 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$, PxP 7 NxP, B-K2 8 P-QN3, NxN 9 QxN, BxB $10 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 211 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 312$ N-B3, B-B3 13 Q-Q2, O-O 14 QR-Q1, R-K1 15 KR-K1, N-N3 $16 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ 17 P-QR4, Q-B3 18 P-R5, N-Q2 19 B-R1, R-K3 $20 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 5, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B} 21 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{R} / 1-\mathrm{K} 122$ P-KB3, P-B4 23 R-K3, P $\times$ P 24 R-B3, N-B4 25 N-B4, P-K6 26 Q-Q4, R-K4 27 P-QN4, P-K7 28 R-K1, Q-R5 29 R-B4, N-Q2 $30 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{BP}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 331 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 732$ P-R4, N-Q4 33 R-B5, $N \times N \quad 34 R \times R$, R-KB1 $35 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 236 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{N}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P} 37$ $R / 1 \times P$ Black resigns.

## Game 3

White: Larsen

1 P-Q4, N-KB3 2 P-QB4, P-K3 3 P-KN3, P-B4 4 P-Q5, P×P 5 PxP, P-QN4 6 B-N2, P-Q3 7 P-QR3, P-QR4 8 N-QB3, Q-N3 $9 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 210 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} 11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$, QN-Q2 12 R-K1, B-R3 13 P-K5, PxP 14 N×KP, N×N $15 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{N}, \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{K} 116 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{NS}$, P-R3 $17 R \times B, R \times R 18 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 6, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} 19 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}$, R-K1 $20 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2, R \times P 21 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 322$ P-KR4, P-N5 23 P×P, BP×P $24 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 5$, R-K4 $25 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{Nt}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{N} 26 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Q} 27$ B-B6, B-B5 28 P-B4, R-QB4 29 B-R4, B-K3 30 R-K1, B-R7 31 R-K3, B-N8 $32 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 433 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 834 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 4$, B-K3 35 P-B5, B-Q4 $\dagger 36 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QR} 8$ 37 P-N3, R-Q8 38 R-K8 $\dagger, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 239 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 8$, B-B6 $40 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R} 41 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 7$ Drawn.
Game $4^{*}$
White: Tahl
ALEKHINE DEFENSE Black: Larsen

Game 5 GRUENFELD DEFENSE White: Larsen Black: Tahl 1 P-Q4, N-KB3 2 P-QB4, P-KN3 3 N-QB3, P-Q4 4 B-B4, B-N2 5 P-K3, P-B4 6 QP×P, Q-R4 7 R-B1, PxP 8 BxP ,
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O-O $9 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B3} 10 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{QxBP} 11$ B-QN3, Q-KR4 12 P-KR3, P-K4 13 B-R2, R-Q1 14 N-Q2, Q-R3 15 Q-K2, B-B4 16 KR-Q1, B-Q6 17 Q-B3, Q-R5 $18 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 3, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 419 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{O} 20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 2$, N-B3 $21 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 522 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KN} 5, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB} 1$ 23 B-Q6 (see diagram), P-KR3 24 B $\times$ R, R×B $25 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 126 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 1, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 327$ N-R4, B-N4 28 N-B5, N-QR4 29 B-R4, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B} 30 \mathrm{NxB}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 231 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 4+$, K-R2 32 N-B5, N-B5 33 P-QN3, N-N3 34 R-QN8, R-B2 35 P-QN4, N/B-Q4 36 P-R3, N-B6 $37 \mathrm{R} / 1-\mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 538 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} 39 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{R}$, NxRP 40 R-Q7, B-B1 41 RxPt, K-N1 42 R-B6, K-N2 43 R-R6, B $\times P 44 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1$, N/R-N4 $45 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 246 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 4, \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{N}$ 47 PxN, N-N4 48 R-R4, K-B3 $49 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 5$, K-B4 50 R-R5 Black resigns.

## Game $6^{*}$

White: Tahl

## ALEKHINE DEFENSE

 Black: Larsen
## Game 7 BLUMENFELD DEFENSE

 White: LarsenBlack: Tahl 1 P-Q4, N-B3 2 P-QB4, P-K3 3 P-KN3, P-QB4 4 P-Q5, PxP 5 PxP, P-QN4 6 B-N2, P-Q3 7 P-QR3, P-QR4 $8 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$, Q-N3 $9 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 210 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} 11$ P-K4, QN-Q2 12 R-K1, B-R3 13 B-B4, N-KN5 14 B-KB1, B-B3 15 N-Q2, N/5-K4 16 P-QR4, PxP $17 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 518 \mathrm{BxB}$, R×B 19 Q-K2, P-B5 20 KR-QB1, R-B1 21 R-B2, R-R2 22 Q-K3, R/2-B2 23 Q-R3, P-N4 $24 \mathrm{BxN}, \mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{B} 25 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ 26 N-N6 (see diagram), P-B6 27 PxP , R×P $28 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 1, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 729 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} 30$ $P \times B, Q \times N / 731 Q \times Q, R \times Q 32 N \times R, P-R 5$ 33 K-N2, P-R6 34 R-QR1, N-B5 35 R-QB1, N-K6 $\dagger 36 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 737 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QN} 1$, P-KR4 38 R-N8, K-R2 $39 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 7, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 5 \dagger$ $40 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 741 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KN} 8, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}+42 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 5$, R×BP 43 R-QR8 (sealed move), R-B7 $44 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3 \dagger 45 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{RP}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P} \dagger 46 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 6 \dagger 47 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} 48 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{N}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 149$ $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 150 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 451 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{P}$, R×P $52 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 353 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 4, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QR} 4$ $54 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 255 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 356 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 4$, R-R5 $\dagger 57 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 458 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 5, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 1$ 59 K-K3, R-QN1 60 K-B3, R-K1 61
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$\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 562 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 5, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 863 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$, R-K5 64 K-B3, K-K4 $65 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 3, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 6 \dagger$ $66 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QN} 667 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 2$, R-N2 68 K-B3, R-N1 69 K-K3, R-KN1 $70 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$, R-KR1 71 N-N3, R-R2 72 K-K3, R-R6 $73 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 774 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QN} 775 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 5$, R-N6 $\dagger 76$ K-B2, R-Q6 $77 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 2, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 5$ $78 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{P} \dagger, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 579 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 7 \dagger 70 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 1$, R-Q3 81 P-N5, K-B6 82 N-R7, K-K6 83 $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 6, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 684 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 7, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 485 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 6$, R-Q2 $86 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5+$, K-K6 $87 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 6, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 7$ $88 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KR} 789 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 5 \dagger, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 690$ K-Q1, R-KN7 91 P-N7 Drawn.

Game 8
White: Tahl

## SICILIAN DEFENSE

1 P-K4 P-QB4 2 N P×P 4 NPP $P-K N 3, B-Q 27 B-N 2, N \times N 8 Q \times N$, B-B3 9 O-O, N-B3 10 R-Q1, B-K2 11 $P-K 5, P \times P 12 B \times B \dagger, P \times B 13 Q \times K P, Q-N 1$ 14 B-B4, QxQ 15 BxQ, O-O $16 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 6, \mathrm{BxB}$ $17 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{B} 118 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 4, \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{N} 119$ P-QB4, K-B1 20 QR-Q1, K-K2 21 R/6-Q2, R-Q1 $22 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} 23 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$, R-Q1 24 RxR, KxR $25 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 126$ $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 3, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 227 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 328 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 229 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 230 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 4 \dagger$ 31 K-Q4, P-KR3 32 K-K4, K-K2 33 N-K1, P-N4 $34 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 535 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 4$, K-Q2 36 P-QR3, N-B2 37 P-N4, P-KR4 $38 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 439 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 4, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 340 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 2$, $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 6 \dagger 41 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ Drawn.

Game 9
White: Larsen

## ENGLISH OPENING

 1 P-QB4, N-KB3 2 N-KB3, P-QB4 3 P-KN3, N-B3 4 B-N2, P-KN3 5 O-O, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 26 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} 7 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} 8 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{P}$, N×N 9 Q×N, P-Q3 10 R-Q1, B-K3 11 $B \times P, N-N 512$ Q-B4, R-N1 13 B-N2, Q-B1 14 N-Q5, R-K1 15 P-KR3, N-K4 16 Q-R4, QxP 17 NxPt, K-R1 18 P-K4, Q-K7 19 $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P} 20 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 5, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 321 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 4$, $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 6 \dagger 22 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KB} 23 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 7, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB} 1$ $24 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 425 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{NP}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 426 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R} 27 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{N} 28 \mathrm{QxP} \mathrm{\dagger}, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 129$ Q-N6 $\dagger, K-R 130$ B-Q4 $\dagger$, P-K4 31 Q-R5 $\dagger$, $K-N 232$ Q-N5 $\dagger, K-B 233 B \times R, Q \times R P$ 34. Q-R5 $\dagger, ~ Q \times Q ~ 35 P \times Q, R-K R 1 \quad 36$ R-QB1, R $\times P 37 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 6, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 138 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 1$, R-R2 39 R-B4, K-K3 $40 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QN} 2$ 41 B-K3 (sealed move), P-R4 42 R-R4, B-B2 43 K-K2, K-Q2 $44 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 3, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 745$ R-R3, B-Q1 46 B-Q2, B-K2 47 R-R4 (or 17 RxP? RxB $\dagger$ etc.), B-N5 48 BxB , $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} 49 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{BP} 50 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 5, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QN7}$ $51 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 7+\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 152 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 653 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, R×P $54 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 6, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 6 \div 55 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 6, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KR} 6$ 56 R-R8才, K-B2 57 R-KB8, R-K6 58 P-K5, R-K8 59 R-K8, R-KR8 60 R-QR8, R-K8 61 R-R7\%, K-Q1 62 R-R2, R-K6 63 R-R8 $\dagger, K-B 264$ R-R6, K-Q1 65 R-R8 $\uparrow$, K-B2 66 R-K8, R-KR6 67 R-KB8, R-K6 68 R-KN8, R-K8 69 R-N2, K-Q1 70 R-QR2, R-K6 71 R-R5, R-K8 72 R-N5, R-K7 $73 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 7, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7 \dagger 74 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 6$, R-K7 75 R-N8 $\dagger, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 276$ R-K8, R-KR7 77 K-B7, R-R2广 78 K-N6, K-Q2 Drawn.Game 10*
White: Tahl
SICILIAN DEFENSE
Black: Larsen

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

## SOCHI IN THE SWING

The chess season is in full swing with three international tournaments taking place at almost the same time: Havana, Sochi and Erevan. Although of the three that at Sochi was probably, say from a technical point of view, the least important, still the participation of Boris Spassky, so close to his challenger's duel with Mikhail Tahl, gave special color to this event. Generally, it is not considered shrewd to show one's hand just before so important a trial of strength. But Spassky can afford to do so. Apparently, he disposes of more than one repertory and, at Sochi, he displayed the "other one," that is, not the one he intends to use in the coming match. Indeed, it appeared Spassky took this tournament rather half-heartedly: he drew six times in the first seven rounds. By half-time, his appetite awoke, and he attained $101 / 2-41 / 2$, and this $70 \%$ score was sufficient for him to tie for first prize. Wolfgang Unzicker was fortunate enough to score the same number of points and, qualitatively, he performed even better.

The following game, it is true, shows no particular brilliancy. Yet it is rated the best game of the tournament, a positional performance in the grand old style.

SICILIAN DEFENSE

$5 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ and $5 \mathrm{QN}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ are good alternatives here.

| 5.0 | Q-B2 | 7 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| $6 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KN} 3$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | $8 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
|  |  | 9 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
|  |  | $\ldots$. |  |



Theory has held this move to be not the best; But Unzicker shows this judgment doubtful, to say the least.


This is the critical situation. If White succeeds in controlling his K5, the struggle will be decided in the strategical sense. Therefore, only 16 . . P-B4 and 16 ... $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ deserve consideration by Black.

After 16 . . . P-B4, the sacrifice by 17 BxQP fails on account of $17 \ldots$. PxB 18 QxPt, K-R1 19 QxR, B-N2 20 Q-R7, R-R1 etc. White of course has better: $17 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 218 \mathrm{PxP}, \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ 19 P-Q6! after which White's Pawn structure is superior.

After 16 . . . P-K4, the sacrifice is not any good either: 17 BxP$\rangle, \mathrm{PxB} 18$ $\mathrm{QxP} \div, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 119 \mathrm{QxR}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 220 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 7, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3$ with a fearful attack for Black. White can gain some positional advantage, however, by 17 PxP, RxR $\dagger 18 \mathrm{BxR}, \mathrm{QxP}$ $19 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q4}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 320 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$, and, if 20 . . P-B4, $21 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$. Still, according to Flohr, 16 . . . P-K4 is best with intent to sacrifice a Pawn: 17 PxP, B-K3.

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
16 \ldots & \text { R-N1? } \\
17 \text { B-Q4 } & B-Q 3
\end{array}
$$

The contimuation: 17 . . . P-B4 18 B-K5, B-Q3 $19 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ leads to practically the same position as in the game.

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
18 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4 \\
19 & \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2 & \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2
\end{array}
$$

$19 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ is met by $20 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$.

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
20 \text { R-K1 } & \text { QR-K1 } \\
21 \text { B-K5! } & \ldots .
\end{array}
$$

This is a strategical knockout.


White maintains his power over K5; and, in consequence, one or more of Black's Pawns remain weak.

| $21 \ldots$ | $R-B 4$ | 23 | $B-R 3$ | $R / 4-B 1$ |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 22 | $B \times B$ | $Q \times B$ | 24 | $R-K 5$ |$\quad P-Q 5$

Black has to do something against the continuing siege of his King Pawn.

| 25 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $27 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $26 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B} \dot{\dagger}$ | $28 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Q}$ |

To sum up. Black has eliminated many pieces, but he did not eliminate that
positional disadvantage. His Pawns in the center are weaker than ever.
28 . . . R-B4 $30 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3 \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3$ 29 R/1-K1 K-B2 $31 \mathrm{R} / 1-\mathrm{K} 4 \quad \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ Black has exhausted his waiting moves -the exchange is just as bad as any other move.

$$
\begin{array}{lc}
32 \text { R×R } & \text { R-QB1 } \\
33 \text { K-K4 } & \ldots .
\end{array}
$$

White completes his blockade of the Black center.

```
33 . . . .
3 4 ~ P - K R 4
K-K2
```

In such positions as this, in which one side is at the mercy of the other, the decision must be forced by aggression on more than one front.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
34 . \ldots & K-Q 3 \\
35 & \ldots-R 5
\end{array}
$$

Thus, White accomplishes a further weakening of Black's position at the cost, however, of putting up temporarily with the weakness of his own King Knight Pawn.

| 35 | A. | PxP | 37 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| K-B3 | R-N2 |  |  |
| 36 RxP | R-KN1 | 38 P-KN4 | P-R4 |
|  |  | 39 P-N5 | $\ldots$. |

Now the vulnerability of the King Knight Pawn is removed, and White's King can take up its former work: to press on Black's center.

39
P-B5
Black cannot bear his waiting attitude any longer. In fact, after other moves, the ending is lost also.

| 40 | K-K4 | P-Q6 | 42 | R-R2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 41 | PxQP | P-B6 | 43 | P-R3! |

After $43 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 2, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 5$, the game does not look so bad for Black.

$44 K-K 5$ !
Precise calculation went into this move. White had to take thorough account of the power of Black's passed Pawn.

44
R-Q2
After 44 . . RxP $45 \mathrm{RxP}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 3$ [else 45 . . . P-B7? $46 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7 \dagger$ 广 $46 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 1$, White's King Knight Pawn is stronger than Black's Bishop Pawn.
$45 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4 \dagger$ !
A fine move: after 45 . . . RxP, White wins by $46 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 3$.

| $45 \ldots$ K-N4 |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| 46 R-QB2 | R-QB2 |
| 47 KxP | P-R5 |

This is a last attempt by Black.


Miniature games are the hors d'oeuvres of chess.
Ottawa (Ont.) Club Championship 1965
Pawn offers embroider a winning game for White.

CARO-KANN DEFENSE
K. Winterton
A. Westwall

White Black




Or 18 . . . P-B4 $19 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 8 \dagger$ and 20 QxB.
$\begin{aligned} & 19 \text { Q-R5 } \\ & \text { On } 19 \ldots \text { Resigns }\end{aligned}$
Manchester, England 1965
Pawn offers give White a promising attack, 9 P-B5!? and 10 O-O but apparently only a draw on 14 . . K-K1 $15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 7 \dagger$ etc.

## SICILIAN DEFENSE

P. Adams

White

| 1 | P-K4 | P-QB4 | 6 | B-QB4 | P-K3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | N-K B3 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | 7 | B-N3 | B-K2 |
| 3 | P-Q4 | PxP | 8 | P-B4 | B-Q2 |
| 4 | NxP | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{KB3}$ | 9 | P-B5 | $P \times P$ |
| 5 | N-QB3 | P-Q3 | 10 | O-O | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
|  |  |  | 11 | B-N5 | B-N5? |
| 48 | $8 \mathrm{PxP} \dagger$ | K-B5 | 50 | P-Q6 | R-B5 |
|  | 9 P-Q5 | K-Q6 | 51 | $\mathrm{RxP} \dagger$ | K x |
|  |  |  | 52 | P-B5 |  |

The lone Rook cannot cope with so many Pawns.

| $52 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 5 \dagger$ | $54 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 5$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{RP}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $53 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} \dagger$ | 55 P | 56 | | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 5$ |
| ---: |

 . . . K-R3 22 B-B4 ${ }^{\circ}$ ! or 21 . . . K-N4 22 P-R4才:
$22 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 7 \dagger \mathrm{~K} \dagger \mathrm{R} 3 \quad 23 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Q}$ Resigns

Regional Championship, Minnesota
A Curt finish to a wild imbroglio.
GRUENFELD DEFENSE



White-initiated exchanges have slimmed down the chances of action. Black now drives White into an enterprise which looks risky for Black.

| $12 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $16 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1 \dagger$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| $13 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 7 \dagger$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $17 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5 \dagger$ |
| $14 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $18 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| $15 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | 19 P 4 | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{BP}$ |
|  |  |  | $20 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
|  |  | $\cdots$ |  |

White's material plus turns minus on RxN; so he attacks.

```
20 . . . .
N-Q5 \(\dagger\)
```


## Resigns

Whichever way the wind may blow, some White piece is bound to go.

by DR．MAX EUWE Former World Champion

## THE ALBIN COUNTER GAMBIT

MANY chessmasters prefer a＂quiet life＂especially when playing with the White pieces．They consider gambits a nuisance，for gam－ bits complicate the game and hence favor the combinative player．

They do even more；they work psychologically．Most gambits are rated insufficient theoretically，and hence the opponent tends to underestimate the gambit，expects too much of the position and wishes to attain a clear advantage and consequently rejects all variations which do not afford such an advantage．In the long run，such a policy means dangerous tactics；for the variations left for the opponent prove inferior more often than not especially when he has attempted to retain his ma－ terial edge．

It is，on the whole，much better to return the gambit Pawn，ac－ cording to the well－known directive，on the earliest occasion which per－ mits some positional advantage．After having accepted the gambit Pawn，it is good that one need not worry about the material relation in the game and converting the material thus is a healthy way of utilizing that advantage．

Positional players，not liking the gambit，avoid or decline it．In the early days of the Budapest Defense（really a counter gambit），White used to avoid it by playing 1 P－Q4，N－KB3 2 N－KB3，instead of 2 P－QB4，P－K4．But $2 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB3}$ has now been abandoned as it offers less by way of possibilities for White than does $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ ，and，morever， the Budapest has lost its power and its terror．

Something similar has happened in the Queen＇s Gambit：White no longer plays 1 P－Q4，P－Q4． 2 N－KB3 in order to avoid the Albin Counter Gambit， 2 ．．．P－K4．Still，the Albin remains somewhat trouble－ some，especially in simultaneous exhibitions．It is not quite clear whether and how White can retain the gambit Pawn in the best way or play for some other advantages．

Modern development of the theory of this gambit，however，runs much in favor of the White player．It even looks as though the Albin may soon be scratched from the list of satisfactory openings．

| White Black |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4 \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | VKM ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| 2 P－QB4 P－K4 |  |
| （See adjacent diagram） | Ull |
| 3 PxKP ．．． |  |
| Declining the gambit makes little | 分汤路 |
| sense．Dr．Tarrasch once played 3 P－K3 |  |
| with the motivation：＂In general，I at－ |  |
| tack with the White pieces while I must， |  |
| on the other hand，defend with the |  |
| Black．If，when playing White，however， |  |
| I must defend，when shall I be able to |  |
| attack at all？＇＂It is not quite clear | Position after $2 . .$. P－K4 |

whether the good Doctor considered the position after 3 P－K3（French Reversed） an attacking one．

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

3 ．．．PxP $4 \mathrm{QxQ} \dot{\mathrm{i}}, \mathrm{KxQ} 5 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ is favorable for White．

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

A The obvious $4 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ is refuted by 4．．．B－N5 $55 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ ，PxP！

1） 6 BxB ？PxPt $7 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2, \operatorname{PxN}(\mathrm{~N}) \dagger$ ！
2） $6 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4 \dagger$ ？ $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 37 \mathrm{BxB}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}+8 \mathrm{KxP}$ ， Q－R5 $\dagger$ etc．

3） $6 \mathrm{PxP}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5 \div 7 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 5$ and Black regains his Pawn with positional advantage．

Other possibilities are：
B $4 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 35 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ ，P－KN4 6 P－B5［an idea of Spassky＇s］，NxP 7 $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{KB} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5 \div 8 \mathrm{QN}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 39 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ ， P－N5 10 O－O！？PxN 11 NxP（Spassky－ Mikenas，Riga 1960）．It is not for com－ mon mortals to decide if White＇s attack is worth a piece！

C 4 P－QR3，N－QB3 5 P－K3［by his fourth move．White made this counter push possible］，P－QR4 6 N －KB3，B－QB4． Chances are about even．
4．．．．
N－QB3

4 ．．．P－QB4 facilitates White＇s de． velopment，partly as Black himself has prevented ．．．B－N5 $\div$ ．So，after $5 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ ， N－QB3 6 PxP．PxP 7 B－Q3，White＇s position is overwhelming．


The Key Position

## Variation A

## 5 P－QR3

The variation is given only for his－ torical reasons：Lasker played it vs． Alekhine at St．Petersburg 1914．After 5 ．．B－KN5 6 QN－Q2，Q－K2 7 P－R3， BxN $8 \mathrm{NxB}, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ ，Black had at least an even game．

## Variation B

(Continue from the Key Position) 5 QN-Q2
As this move is no longer considered best, the following is merely a short review of the most important lines.


Subvariation 1

| $5 \ldots$ | B-QN5? | 8 Q-N3 | $\mathrm{KN}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $6 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N} \dagger$ | 9 P-N3 | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |  |
| 7 BxB | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 5$ | 10 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ |  |

White stands better.
Subvariation 2
(Continue from last diagram)
5 ....
P-B3
In typical gambit style.

| 6 PxP | QxP |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 7 | P-KN3 | B-KB4 |
| 8 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5$ |

Or 8 . . . $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} 9 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 4$ followed possibly by $10 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 4$.
$90-0!$
$\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 7$

9 . . . B-B7 10 Q-K1, B-N3 $11 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3$, $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 712 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5, \mathrm{NxR} 13$ QNxP is very favorable for White.

| 10 | R-N1 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 5$ | 12 | $\mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3!$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R}$ | 13 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
|  | P-QN4 |  |  |  |

White has more than sufficient compensation for the Exchange.
Subvariation 3
(Continue from last diagram)
5 B-KN5!


Sub-sub-variant 1.

| 6 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $9 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| $7 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 5$ | $\mathrm{~B} \dagger$ | $10 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B} \dagger$ |
| 8 | $\mathrm{O} \dagger \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |  |  |
| $8 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $11 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\cdots$ |

On 11 Q-B4, P-B3 12 PxP, NxP, Black is all right.


The chances are equal. On $14 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5$, Black plays 14 , . . N-K2!
Sub-sub-variant II.
(Continue from last diagram)
$\begin{array}{llclr}6 \text { P-KN3 } & Q-Q 2 & 8 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} & \mathrm{KN}-\mathrm{K} 2 \\ 7 \text { B-N2 } & \text { O-O-O } & 9 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3 & \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3 \\ \text { Black } & \text { recaptures } & \text { his Pawn } & \text { with }\end{array}$ equality.

Subvariation 4
(Continue from next to last diagram)

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

This move leads by transposition into position in Variation C, Subvariation 3.

## Variation C

(Continue from the Key Position) 5 P-KN3!
The most logical and straightforward continuation: White loses no time and prepares for direct exertion of pressure on the Queenside, aiming at an eventual $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 4$.


Subvariation 1
5 ....
B-N5 $\dagger$
6 QN-Q2
....

The game takes on the character of Variation B, subvariation 1. It does not matter much that white plays P-QR3 a few moves later.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
6 \ldots \mathrm{~N} 2 & \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5 \\
7 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2
\end{array}
$$

7 . . . KN-K2 \& P-QR3, $\mathrm{BxN} \dagger 9 \mathrm{BxB}$, $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 310 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 3$ leads to Variation B, subvariation 1.

| 8 | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 9 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ | $\mathrm{~KB} N$ |
| 10 | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}$ |

10 . . . BxN 11 PxB! NxP 12 R-K1 is also very strong for White.

| 11 | $\mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{N}$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 12 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ |
| 13 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |  |

White's position is overwhelming. On $13 .$. QxP . White answers $14 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$.

Subvariation 2
(Continue from last diagram)

| 5 M-N | B-KN5 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 6 B-N2 | Q-Q2 |
| 7 O-O | O-O-O |

The Pawn storm by 7. . P-KR4 produces no effective end: $8 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$, P-R5 9 B-B4, PxP $10 \mathrm{BxP}, \mathrm{KN}-\mathrm{K} 211$ $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 4$ ! The last move is always the motive and force of this variation for White. Here White stands better (SokolskySimagin, Moscow 1953).

7 . . KN-K2 was refuted convincingly in Tolush-Horne (Hastings 1953. 4): 8 P-N4! NxNP 9 P-K6! BxP 10 $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 5, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 111 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4 \dagger$ etc.

7 . . KN-K2 is met by $9 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$. Relatively best, however, is $8 . . \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{R} 4$ with the following consequences: $9 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3$, and
a) 9 . . B-KBt $10 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$, PxP e.p. 11 Q×P. K-N1 12 P-N3 with a clear superiority for White:
b) $9 . \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 410 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 411$ Q-R3. N-QB3 $12 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ or 12 BxN with an advantage for white,

| $9 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 6!$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| :---: | ---: |
| Not $9 \ldots \mathrm{Q} \cdot \mathrm{PP} 10 \times-N 5$. |  |
| $10 \mathrm{~N}-K 5!$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| $11 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{N}$ |
| $12 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4$ |  |

White has an easy win (Spassky-Forintos, Sochi 1965).

## Subvariation 3

(Continue from last diagram)

| $5 \ldots$ | $B-K 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $6 \mathrm{QN}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\ldots$. |



White's position is very promising. He need not fear the loss of his Queen Bishop Pawn as the possibilities along his diagonal, KN2-QN7 supply sufficient compensation.

Here are some likely continuations:
Sub-sub-variant I.

| $6 \ldots$ | $B-Q N 5$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| 7 B-N2 | $B \times P$ |
| $8 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\ldots$. |

Now White stands better after $8 \ldots$ $\mathrm{BxN} 9 \mathrm{QxB}, \mathrm{KN}-\mathrm{K} 210 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 311$ $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 2$. And likewise after 8 . . B-Q4 $9 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 210 \mathrm{QNxP}$.

Sub-sub-variant II.
(Continue from last dlagram)
$\begin{array}{ll}6 \ldots \mathrm{~B} 2 & \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2 \\ 7 \mathrm{~B} & \ldots\end{array}$
Now, after 7 . . R-Q1 $8 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{KN}-\mathrm{K} 2$ 9 Q-R4, N-N3 10 P-QR3, B-K2 11 P-QN4, $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} 12 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$, White's position is superior: e.g. 12 . . B-R6 $13 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 5, \mathrm{BxB}$ $14 \mathrm{KxB}, \mathrm{QNxP} 15 \mathrm{BxP}$ (Pirc-Kostich, Zagreb 1947).

| $7 \ldots$ | $O-O-O$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| 8 O-O | KN-K2 |
| 9 Q-R4 | P-QR3 |

Or 9
N-N3 10 N 3 ,

R-Q1.

| 10 | P-QN4 | P-KR4 | $13 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 5$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QN} 1$ | $14 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$ |  |
| $12 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $15 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ |  |  |

And White won in the game, GligorichLeban, in the latest Yugoslavian Championship 1965.
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TOURNAMENT NOTES

## Progress Reports for Golden Knights Tournaments

## 13th Annual Championship

In the 1959 Golden Knights, no new Finals section has completed play. The list of prospective cash prize wimers re. mains as given, page 345 , November issue.

## 14th Annual Championship

In the 1960 Golden Knights, no new Finals section has finished play for this issue either.

## 15łh Annual Championship

In the 1961 Golden Knights, Finals sec. tion 61-Nf 8 has completed play, and the contestants therein scored these weighted-point totals:*

G Carlson 42.9; J D Moore 34.95; E S Jacob 31.8; A P Butler 24.55; D D Thurman 22.8; H A Jania 21.8; and W W Fuchs withdrew.

Meanwhile, E A Jaaska, H P Pateman and NLi Petri have qualified for assignment to the Finals.

## 16th Annual Championship

In the 1963 Golden Knights, the following contenders qualified for assignment to the Finals: P M Lamb, W $P$ Bigler, C Adashek, B R Worrell, H Faivus, R G Christiansen, J H Marica, M L Hatch, H A Fisher, J A Starinkas and J W Weihe.

None have qualified from the Prelims to the Semi-finals for this issue.

## 17th Annual Championship

In the 1964 Golden Knights, the following contenders have qualified for assignment to the Finals: R L Anderson, G $W$ Sullinger, $B$ Maillard and $R$ A Cayford.

Also, these players qualified for the Semi-finals: W Halpern, J Crutchley, $R$ Lohrman, R C Howard, R F MeGregor and M W Herrick.

## 18th Annual Championship

In the recently current Golden Knights, the following contenders have qualified for assignment to the Semi-finals: F R Stauffer, F D Lynch, C M Crenshaw, O

[^3]H Phipps, I Erkmanis, C Schofield, J P Laird, M Ribowsky, E Polgar, L B Joyner, C A Van Brunt, P Marks, J Duchesne, G L Frank, A C de Sherbinin, J E Bischoff, L Fogg, M Gottesman, F Ashley, E C Brown, H E Winston, S Klein, O W Strahan, J R Daniels, J Yehl, W A Norin, J Ozols, A F Woods and B 1. Pattesoin.

As of the end of October, 180 preliminary sectlons were in play, or 1260 contestants. With entries closed as of November 30 , we shall finish assigning prelim sections in mid-December.

## 19th Annual Championship

This newest edition of the popular Golden Knights, the 1966 nineteenth Annual Golden Knights and eighth annual U. S. Open Postal Chess Championship is now open for applications. We shall not make up and send out assignments, however, till after the Xmas mail rush subsides. Look for assignments in January 1966.

## POSTALMIGHTIES!

## Class Tournaments

These Postalites have won or tied for first. in 1963, 1964 and 1965 Class Tourneys.
Tourney Players Place Score
63-C 286


$$
\begin{aligned}
& 47 \text { T E Shaffer } \\
& 48 \text { T E Shatfer } \\
& \begin{array}{ll}
1 \text { st } & 42-12
\end{array} \\
& 49 \text { R Leonard. } \\
& \text { 1st } 5 \text {-1 }
\end{aligned}
$$

## Prize Tournaments

These Postalites have won pizes in 1963, 1964 and 196a Prize Tourneys.

| Tourney |  | Players | Place | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $63-\mathrm{P}$ | 79 | 13 Ash | 1-2 | 5 -1 |
|  |  | E V B Chase | 1-2 | $5-1$ |
|  | so | M O'Donnell | .1st | $4-2$ |
|  |  | F Hacker | .2-3 | 32 -21 |
|  |  | P Lamb | .2-3 | 312 2 2 |
|  | 88 | J 'T Alexander | .1st | $6-0$ |
|  |  | A Stern | .2nd | 4-2 |
|  | 90 | J A Wennerstron | .2nd | 4-2 |
| 6t-P | 19 | D Roubik | . Ist | $5-1$ |
|  | 28 | C W Hathway | 2nd | $4 \underline{1}-13$ |
|  | 47 | P D Hoagland | . 1st | $5-1$ |
|  |  | O Birsten | .2-3 | $4-2$ |
|  |  | W Weil | 2-3 | $4-2$ |
|  | 51 | D W Brison | .1st | $6-0$ |
|  | 52 | R L Anderson | . 1st | $5-1$ |
|  | 39 | F A Jarvis | .2-3 | 4-2 |
|  |  | I Lacey | 2-3 | $4-2$ |
|  | 71 | R L Sample | . 2 nd | 12-13 |
|  | 74 | A C Morrill | . 1 st | $5 \mathrm{~S}-3$ |
|  |  | J Bishop .. | . 2nd | $5-1$ |
|  | 76 | P Klein .. | ., 1st | $5-1$ |
|  | 95 | F Ekstrom | . 1-3 | 42-12 |
|  |  | S Hujber | . 1-3 | 4 $\frac{1}{2}-1 \frac{1}{2}$ |
|  |  | R Nester ... | .1-3 | 4 ${ }^{2}-1 \frac{1}{2}$ |
|  | 98 | H E Winston | ...1st | $5 \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ |
|  |  | M B Matty . . . | . 2 nd | 42-1 |
|  | 99 | B J Robinson | . . 1st | 52- 3 |
|  |  | E H Peterson | ...2nd | 412-12 |
|  | 10.4 | Mrs E A Schaefer | . 1 ist | 512- |
| $65 . \mathrm{P}$ | 14 | T W Benham | .1st | 3-1 |
|  | 16 | E J MeLaughlin | .1st | 6-0 |
|  |  | S Latus | 2nd | $5-1$ |

## Time Complaints and Xmas Moratorium

After a hectic year for the Postal Chess department, we've finally caught up with processing and sending out time complaint inquiries. Many went out quite late; but your complaint, if merited, was or will be acted upon in due course after the inquiry.

Now it is time to remind you that mail from mid-December on is apt to be erratic. So we recommend you send moves as per usual, even try a "repeat" if an opponent fails to answer. But Please do not file any time complaint during the period of from December 15 to January 6. Most delays, we've found, for this time, will turn out to be accidents of the season, and our inquiries are also apt to go astray.

By January 6, if you still have no reply and have sent move and repeat, report so to us along with opponent's name, address and tourney number. If you have not sent a repeat, do so and report likewise if there is no timely response.

## 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 $\$ 2.00$. You may enter as many sections as you please at $\$ 2.00$ each. Send coupon below.

CHESS REVIEW $\square$ Cbeck if a new134 W. 72d St., comer to Postal Chers New York, N. Y. 10023
I enclose $\$ \ldots . . . . .$. Enter my name in $\mid$ Postal Chess CLASS Tournaments. The amount enclosed covers the entry fee of $\$ 2.00$ per section. Kindly start/continue (strike out one) me in Class........

## NAME

ADDRESS
CITY $\ldots+\ldots \ldots \ldots . . . .$.

## 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 skilf. 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 1 st and 2d place winners in each section. Credits may be used to purchase chess books or equipment.

The entry fee is only $\$ 3.25$. You may enter as many sections as you please at $\$ 3.25$ each. Send coupon below.

## CHESS REVIEW

$134 \mathrm{~W}, 72 \mathrm{~d}$ St.
New York, N. Y. :0023
I enclose $\$$............. Enter my name in (how many?) sections of your Postal Chess PRIZE Tournaments. The amount enclosed covers the entry fee of $\$ 3.25$ per section. Kindly start/continue |
(strike out one) me in Class......... (strike out one) me in Class.......... comer to Postal Chass 374

# POSTAL MORTEMS 

## Game Reports Received

 during October 1965To report results, follow instructions on pages $4 \& 5$ of your booklet on Postal Chess strictly and exactly. Otherwise the report may be misrecorded, held up or even lost.

Please note: Winners (and those with the White pieces in case of draws) must report as soon as result is confirmed by opponent. The opponent may report also to ensure his record and rating going through but must then state clearly that he was the loser (or played Black in case of a draw).

Game reports sent in time for receipt by dates given above should be printed below. And the players concerned should check to see that they are so published. To spot them, look under your section number, first by the key (e.g., 65-C indicating Class Tourney begun in 1965) and by number (466) given in text below the key.

Symbol $f$ indicates a win by forfeit without rating credit; a shows a rating credit adjudication; of 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 December 1963 become past-due this month. Get in reports to reach us here by December 31 to avoid losing on double-forfeit (both players lose!).
Tourneys 1-404: 383 Eulenstein withdraws. 384 Fulenstein withdraws.

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

Tourneys 1.299: 69 Graber tops Bassin twice and splits two with Tomas. 105 Steeger tops (a) Bartle 0. 108 Sattinger axes Evans. 111 Eulenstein loses to De Long and withdraws. 115 Gieber bests Caster but bows to Cunningham. 130 De Lozier licks Stonkus, 135 Michael mauls Simpson. 136 Correction: King won from Ebbs, 137 De Paul, Laver tie. 138 Brand conks Cooley. 150 Correction: Ploss won from Stonkus. 157 Reinbold bests Barnard. 158 Field fells Reinbold and (2f) Hodges. 168 Tyner tops Booth. 190 Fee fells Gawler twice and Yeakel once. 206 Caruso conks Cohen. 247 Neff nips Williams. 253 Noble tops (2f) Bowman, 259 George rips Robertson. 263 Cuomo, Little split two. 273 Stayart stops Peacock. 274 Wipper whlps Wells. 277 Maker mauls McQuarrie. 281 Pampel halts Hahn twice. 283 Tiling tops Maddux. 288 Weber whips Keeney. 290 Williams fells Forman. 295 Younghusband bests Constantine. 297 Correction: Struss fells Finn.
Tourneys 300-399: 308 Abraham wins from Ruscio and May; May withdraws. 310 O'Neil nips Ancil. 316 Ralley rips Board. 322 Kook tops Atchley and (2f) Sakes. 332 Kyreakakis bests Seymour once and Campbell twice. 333 Cone, Heuchert tie. 339 Spooner spills Curtis and Petty. 340 Zanath elips McCloskey. 347 LiaBre withdrawn. $30 \tilde{7} 7$ Vest beats Barra; Funkhauser bows to Vest but bests Barra. 359 Pierce tops Hoeft twice. 364 Huckin tops Audrain and Murphy each twice: Fulk tops Murphy twice. 365 Friedberg withdrawn. 366 Weber whips Skrzypinski. 368 Gerzadowicz beats Klein but bows to Opp; Opp tops Klein twice. 371 Schreiner bests Bourgeois twice and Opp once. 382 Boroughs beats Harper, 388 Venesaar tops Mitchell once and Alvis twice. 390 Burgess, Folkman tie. 392 Lundstedt rips Rice; Buen-tello-Malo withdraws, 397 Cloyd, Folkes tie. 398 Ross rips Hasbrouck; Shaff withdrawn. Tourneys 400-416: 407 Piracci wins from Noreen, 408 Smith smites Moorhead. 409 Fontaine, Neville stop Stephansky.

## Starłed in 1965 (Key: 65-C)

Tourneys 1-39: 3 Fee and Blewald each win twice from Landey; Wallach ties Bie-
wald and tops Landey; Biewald bests Fee. 5 Lindberg tops (a) Lesniewski. 6 Aavik axes Gosswiller. 7 Bailey bests Mullen twice. 9 Fee wins two from both Rosenwald and Harris. 10 MacConnell fells Fountain; Perry stops Angstemberger. 12 Wells beats Christy but bows to Bensky, 13 Martin downs Destasio. 15 Hogan tops and ties Viets. 17 Cragg cracks Axup. 18 Kohn beats Shearman and Schecter twice each. 19 Beam bests Siadak. 20 Cantone tops Leiserson twice. 23 Bancroft bests Hartner. 31 Woodworth whips Siadak. 32 Saudek tops Pace twice. 35 Sachs tops Sobieraj and Costa twice each. 37 Finelli rips Roscoe: Peskowitz, Sullivan tie. Tourneys 40.99: 41 Harrison wins from Gordon, 47 Grossman. Shaffer tie. 48 Harrison beats Boe: Young withdraws. 49 Leonard tops Gayton and (2f) Hogan. 59 Goldy rips Reitz. 60 Montgomery loses to Hill and to Harms and ties Harms. 61. Devereaux conks Kingsley twice, 62 Froag halts Pappas. 64 Crow cracks Voight twice, 66 Harrison tops (a) Crisp, 68 Martin conks Carpenter twice. 69 Hauser halts Hanes, 72 Pratt bests Bakie. 73 Kay conks Bram twice; Blochinger bests Scheper. 78 Medlockin, Quane tie. 80 Hendry stops Stonkus. 84 Ballenger downs Ducker, 86 Fales Jolts Jacobsen. 88 Menzel mauls Bradley twice, 93 Glass tops (2a) Searles. 94 Boynton. Holmberg tie: Heaney halts Skotte, 95 Ballard beats Siadak, 97 Carrington loses to Carpenter and (f) Underhill, 99 Tarjan withdraws.
Tourneys 100-139: 100 Buhalo wins from Sipples. 105 Harrison tops (a) Monaco. 107 Cameron conks Nalepa. 108 Stein loses to Huber and ties Harrison. 111 McAteer rips Ratcliff. 112 Corthell conks Milden, 113 Campion tops Chieffo once and Langer twice: Probst licks Langer. 114 Story tops (2f) glass. 115 Harrison halts Yenalavage and Slomowitz. 116 Asher tops McCoubrey twice, 117 Haher halts Sorahan. 118 Streeter rips Ruhlen. 122 Chosak withdraws. 123 Lion loses to Harrison and splits two with Noel. 127 Sharpel conks Cavallaro. 128 Sakarias loses to Lynn and ties Orem; Orem conks Cooley. 129 Pantazi splits two with Wilson and whips Connolly. 130 Suyker nips Nilsson. 134 Eulenstein withdraws, 136 Brockman withdraws: Moody tops Orem twice. 138 MeDonald downs Schultz.
Tourneys 140-199: 141 Martin wins from Bixby. 142 Hausgaard tops Quinlan twice. 143 Berry bests Tuttle. 147 Hendricks drubs Ellis but loses twice to Campbell. 148 Lauer licks Andruss, 149 Eulenstein withdraws. 151 Lewis tops and ties DeVin. 152 Stein stops Hadey and La Flam. 153 Garber bests Siplles. 155 Mierzejewski bow's to Schreiner but bests Carney. 165 Hickman tops Skinner twice. 167 Meyers loses to Leonard once and twice to Oppenheimer. 169 Skinner whips Whalen twice and Blumetti once. 175 Strong mauls Morgan. 176 Manning, Brown best Beechler. 177 Berry, Wolf split two. 178 Nowak withdraws. 183 Parfitt outpoints Pauley. 189 Uireich withdraws. 193 Uireteh withdraws, 198 Carpenter rips Rairdin.
Tourneys 200-365: 205 Sheehan wins from Rose. 206 Bancroft bests Yeakel. 208 Long,

"1 let 'im get away with sayin' his pop could lick you; but, when he said his old man could spot you a Rook, too

Rouner tie. 210 Neff nips Angstenberger and Gibbs. 213 Mahon, Bancroft top Mantell. 214 Yehl yerks Slomowitz. 217 Seery conks Kaufman. 225 Roberts rips Reichman. 228 Wilson replaces De Rosa. 231 Bane bests Thumen. 234 Shepard licks Larzelere. 237 Hamm, Morrin split two. 241 Marks mauls Vore. 249 Ferry replaces Sipples. 255 Huber rips Rader. 262 Bolmen, Chosak withdraw. 264 Carpenter rips Ross. 265 Gabriel tops Cortese twice. 268 Kinslow replaces Goff, 269 Canfield replaces Wong. 279 Farrison replaces Augay, 280 Jamison replaces Mangold. 291 De Paut replaces Hewitt, 337 Quane replaces Kalamarz, 338 Rosenthal replaces Kalamarz.

## PRIZE TOURNAMENTS

Seven-man Tourneys for Premiums

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

Notice: Game reports on all tourneys begun in December 1963 become past-due this month. Get in reports to reach us on or before December 31, to avoid losing on dou-ble-forfeit (both players lose!).

Winners now set up by closing of the tourneys begun in October 1963 appear in Postalmighties! of this issue.
Tourneys 1-112: 88 Alexander wins from Johnson. 95 Schwarz withdrawn. 103 Duykers conks Leschensky.

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

Tourneys 1-89: 28 Phillips tops Taylor. 41 Becker. Carr tie. 47 Cook whips Weil. 49 Post halts Hayes, 51 Von Saleski bows to Brison but licks Lacey. 52 Mackin. Martin tie. 59 Sorenson, Lacey best Orbanowski; Lacey loses (a) to Jarvis but licks Gwynn. 65 Hamilton tops Spooner, 70 Neff nips McCarthy. 72 Spohr, Hyde clout Clarkson; Leach beats Burk. 73 Taylor licks Halpern. 74 Bishop bests Gaissert. 75 Hartwig whips Weber: Ward wallops Tarter. 76 Klein clips Stevens. SI Wipper fells Faires. 83 Evans smears smart. 84 McFarland bests Burke; Joslin jolts Burke and ties McFarland. 85 Rassoch withdraws. S6 Shepherd tweaks Tweten. 88 Esposito. Wells tie: Hildenbrand, Svoboda tie. 89 Stephens stops Dickey and Rollins: Dickey downs Walkling.
Tourneys $90 \cdot 120: 90$ Ashley. Parks tie. 92 Williams tops Thompson. 94 Webls withdrawn. 95 Ekstrom, Henriksen crack Crivy; Nester, Hujber maul Maier. 96 Clark clips Charles and Valadez; Ercegovac ties Clark and loses to Ehrman. 98 Matty mauls Crum; Gallagher, Winston best Sanborn. 99 Robinson rips Peterson and Trotzuk, 102 Rockmore bests Hamilton but bows to Dragonetti; Mang withdrawn, 106 Van de Carr tops Tweten and ties Ward. 107 Story stops Friedman. 108 Haines bests Kyker but bows (a) to Beer. 110 Clay clips Clark; Levy licks Hunt. 111 Kussack conks Yanis and Kline. 113 Dyba downs Kirk; Bettini, Iappini tic. 115 Soforic downs Dale. 116 Barker Jolts Johnson. 118 Sylvester rips Reno.

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

Tourneys 1-24: 1 Sampson wins from Londry but bows to Wendling and Dumne; Morris downs Dunne. 2 Greer strafes Strupeck. 3 Valenteen licks Shandor. \& Rugs rips Morris and Post: Schmidt whips Wennerstrom. 7 Borker beats Schmitt and Kohn but bows to Dyba and Pohl. 10 Mott-Smith clouts Klacsmann. 11 Wilson whips Hendry; Wilson, Hailey ax Eatman. 12 Robinson routs Roberts: Ellis, Encinas and Robison fell Faivus. 14 Benham beats Humphrey and Borker but bows to Herrick. 15 Cross cracks Paetkau. 16 Hayes licks Bolles but loses to Latus, MrLaughlin and Hall. 17 Becker bests Wilson. 18 Hayes, Jacobsen tie. 19 Cohen conks King and Haines. 20 Sutherland withdrawn, drops (a) to Goldwasser. 21 Lieberman loses to Larsen but licks Fisch; Hujber halts Larsen. 22 Sullivan socks Lundy, 23 Endsley hits Haines and Hahn; Hahn hurts Haines.
Tourneys 25-49: 25 Leiweke bests Anderson but bows to Nechal; Hartenstein with-

## CHESS CHARTS - The Ideal Christmas Gift

Each opening statistically analyzed and presented in easily read booklet-chart form so that you can determine at a glance the best move to make at any stage of the opening. Charts are based on analysis of thousands of tournament games by the world's greatest players. For example, our chart of the Sicilian Defense covers the opening moves of 6,804 games; other charts in proportion.
Each chart indicates the actual percentage of wins for every single move, whether by White or Black.

The scientific way to study the openings. Now used by thousands of the world's great players. ORDER NOW FOR CHRISTMAS DELIVERY.

Charts now available: (Simply check off and mail.)
() 1. The Sicilian Defense
() 7. The Queen's Gambit
() 2. The Ruy Lopez Opening
() 8. The English Opening
() 3. The Nimzo-Indian Defense
() 9. The Blackmar-Diemer Gambit
() 4. The King's Indian Defense
() 10. The King's Gambit
() 5. The French Defense
() 11, Bird's Opening
() 6. The Caro-Kann Defense
() 12. The Pirc Defense

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
drawn. 27 Burton, Hoey whip Woelfinger: Siadak loses to Rattler but licks Hoglund. 28 Reedy rips Matty. 29 Komor. Bratz and Fuchs conk Pariseau. 30 Encinas tops Thomas. 33 Kelin beats Becker, 34 Brockman withdraws, drops (a) to Heaney. 35 Hall nips Nolde: Helper halts Harris. 36 Tweten tweaks Frank. 37 Duncan downs Leonard. 38 Brenner halts Hall, 39 Blanchard whips Warner. 40 Carman withdrawn. 41 Lome, Sheetz rip Rein; Sheetz, Carney nip Nelson. 42 Crow tops (a) Nowak. 44 Pavitt Jars Jones. 45 Wheeler, Josin and Soforic beat Berssten; Dobbins downs Criner; Wheeler whips Soforic. 17 Ashley axes Aks: Hansen hexes Totte. $4 \$$ Fazziola beats Beer. 49 Daly withdrawn.
Tourneys 50-91: 50 Sylvester ties Bolden and tops McGrath; Hynes halts Thoms and McGrath. 52 Rapier, Waldman tie. 53 Long licks Johnson. 54 Jones jars Hall. 57 Michaels replaces Sauvageau. 59 Crutchley licks Parker. 61 Erkmanis mauls Goff. 65 Gribushin bests Peterson. 69 Lieberman whips Weyl. 70 Cotter stops Steffee. 78 Parks replaces Stevens.

GOLDEN KNIGHTS
Progressive Quallfication Championships

## 13th Annual Championship-1959 FINALS (Key: 59:Nf)

Sections 1-32: 29 Capillon tops (f) Koller but loses to Stevens. 31 Lundh stops Stevens: Limarzi tops Millette and ties Stevens.

## 14th Annual Championship-1960

SEMI-FINALS (Key: 60-Ns)
Sections 1-80: 78 Fleming, Self df. 80 Fickenscher and Langford df.

FINALS (Key: 60-Nf)
Sections 1.32: 30 Stolzenbers wins from Martin; Travis trips Ware, 31 Ashley, Leh-
pamer tie. 32 Burdick downs Morris: Ladacki withdraws.

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

Sections 1-95: 59 Muir df with Stolzenberg and Wilson: Steputat, Wilson df. 61 Belisle, Herman df. 62 Buckendorf, Reich df. 67 Butler, Engstrom df. 78 Jaaska jolts Bauer. 87 Shaw, Pateman shave Allen, 93 Li Petrí tops (a) Carroll.

## FINALS (Key: 61-Nf)

Sections 1-33: 7 Gribushin wins from Suyker. 8 Moore. Thurman tie. 10 Stuford,

## Solutions to CHESSBOARD MAGIC!

No. 1 White draws by $1 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 2, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 52$ $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 3$, and (a) 2 . . . K-Q6 $3 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 4$, K-K7 $4 \mathrm{KxB}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 6 \quad 5 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 66$ K-K4, KxP 7 K-B3 etc. or (b) $2 \ldots$. K-Q4 $3 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 4 . \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 34 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 5, ~ \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 65$ K-B4 and back to KN1.
No. 2 White wins by 1 N-K8! K-N3 2 P-R5 $\dagger$, RxP 3 P-B5 $\dagger$, RxP 4 P-N4, R-B4 5 B-B5t, RxB $6 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 7$ ! any 7 PxR mate. No. 3 White draws by $1 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 7, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 62$ $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 64, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 3: 3 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 4, \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 74 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 2$ [not 4 N-N3 as Black wins with 4 K-B3 $5 \quad \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 1, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 36 \quad \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 2 . \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 3$ ! and . . K K-B4 and . . K K-B5], K-B3 5 K-N8! [on 5 K-Q8. Black wins by 5 $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ ], K-Q3 $6 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 7, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 3$ [or $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 47 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 4 \div$ etc.] $7 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 6$, K-B4 $8 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 5, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 59 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 4, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 610$ $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{R} 1, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 711 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 3$, KxN $12 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ Stalemate.
$\dagger=$ check; $\ddagger=$ dbl. check; $;=$ dis. ch.

Strahan tie. 18 Tuttle tops Stern: Warren whips Swift. 21 Ogni downs DeVault. 22 Fearey. Pittinger tie: Joyner jolts Tucker. 23 Yanis tops McKaig. ties Meiden and loses to Russanow. 24 Pehas conks Carr; Algase bows to Buczko but bests Carr. 25 Smith smites Wisegarver, 28 Barnett, Churchill tie. 30 Weil whips Lense: Ladacki withdraws.

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

Sections 1.177: 12.4 Gleeson wins from Tolins. 149 Chobot, Olsen tie. $1 \overline{5} 1$ Correction: Schaffel won from A. Johnson. 173 Stolzenberg bests Boyer.

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

Sections 1-59: 4 Gaughran wins from Sloane. 26 Muller bests Berg. 34 Sonshine withdraws. 36 Adashek downs May. 38 Eucher smites Smidchens, 39 Eucher, Stauffer stop Giles; Hendry bows to Eucher but bests Giles: Stauffer stops Howell. 40 Worrell wins from Bielefeld but bows to Soules: Bielefeld. Faivus tie, 45 Byrd stops Stark. 46 Gorman licks Burlingame but loses to Walker. 48 Christianson mauls Marschall. 49 Marica halts Hart, 51 Marinis mauls McCormick. 52 Hatch stops Steputat. 54 Fisher quells Quiring and Scott; Moorin mauls Scott and Feder: Lohrman licks Feder and Scott. 55 Starinaks clips Clark. 58 Wasiliew halts Hyde. 59 Steputat bests Edgecomb but bows to Legault: Legault downs Dube. Sections 60-56: 60 Condon wins from Gray. 62 Weihe whips McKaig and Rattler. 64 Rudelis rips Rattler; Thompson mauls Mooney, E6 McCreight withdrawn.

## FINALS (Key: 63-Nf)

Sections 1-14: 1 Katz wins from Colins. 2 Berg beats Robinson. 3 Dreibergs drubs Sokoler. 4 Burdick bows to Kucera but bests Carr; May mams Schimel. 5 Julson loses to Giles but lieks Cotter; Bender bams Boldt. 6 Daly downs Steputat. 7 Farber fells Dulicai. 8 Ellis axes Parr. 9 Aguilera mauls May; Goodman tops (a) Lay. 11 Abram downs Donins.

## 17th Annual Championship-1964

PRELIMINARY ROUND (Key: 64-N)
Sections 1-151: 8 Halpern halts Middeton, Sigl and Peck. 62 Adorjan, Berger-Olsen tie. 83 Yeht yerks Coveyou. 88 Tomaino tops Hamilton, 91 Lee licks Wojtowicz, 94 McKaig. Schleidt tie. 96 Crutchley conks Kaman. 101 Bauer bests Siegel. 106 Barrick Genens tie. 110 Siolzenberg beats Burtingame, 114 Opp. Klinkner ax Oswald. 115 Hesse mauls Marshall. 116 Higgins, Alwan ax Endsley. 117 Lohrman bests Derr but bows to Tremblay. 122 Spencer jolts Johnson. 123 Diekhaus downs Aicher. 129 Einstein stops Hamilton, 130 Boldt, Connell tie. 133 McDonald, Valdes-Perdomo tie. 134 Paterson tops Peterson: Peterson, Paterson down Aparicio. 136 Correction: Howard won from Carper. 137 Smithers smites Keiser; Ozots bests Bier. 138 Ross rips Waffle; Ross. Whitman rout Patisen, 1.11 Donins downs Egle. 142 Werner jars Jacob. 146 Priebe, MeGregor fell Fatist. 149 Roskind, Herrick rip von Saleski; Roskind conks McGuinness; Hanson withdrawn. 151 Schwartz downs Brodeur.

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

Sections 1-46: 1 Anderson wins from Kirchner and ties Macormac: Sullivan socks Macormac. 3 Kehler, Loeffler tie; Stiefel stops Buhalo. 5 Brand halts Hoglund. o Sullinger loses to Caroe but licks Yan de Carr and wright. \& Edberg bests Pipher. 9 Stern ties Stayart and loses to Nusser; Maillard nips Nusser. 19 Oakes, Ferber crack Croyle. 11 Smith smites Fairbank. 13 Dunham downs Monson. 15 Poliakoff conks Kaye and Gurton and ties Gibbs. 17 Rugs, Bauman rip McDonald: Rugs routs Frank. 18 Shreve shreds Frank. 19 Femner, Mason, Wilson and Suyker mob Faivus; Wilson bows to Suyker but bests Mason. 20 Schwartz whips Walmisley. 22 Roberts, Ten-
ner tie. 23 O'Neil nips Levy. 24 Levy ties Warren but loses to Rivera and Makaitis, 25 Leinwebber beats Butland. 27 Rosenberg biffs Bland; Howell bams Ward. 28 Siegel resigns to Cayford, Penniston. Herrick. Shipley and Domann; Cayford tops Shipley and Penniston, 29 Henriksen rips Wright. 31 Solot bests Alberts. 46 Klein replaces Carson.

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

Sections 1-29: 1 Houser wins from Jachimowič: Marks withdrawn. 2 Meeks, Orih nij Nickel; Orth conks Carpenter. 3 Wilson whips Carpenter; correction: Tileston won from Gross. 6 Spangler bests Behrens. 9 Cody conks Cave. 10 Woelfinger licks Limbeck: Anderson downs Eves. 11 Howell ties Heath, but loses to Smith. 13 Lynch smites Smith. 14 Rufty tops (f) Loyal. 15 Phipps, Crenshaw sock Parsons; Crenshaw rips Remer: Jamison jars Harper. 16 Smith smites Corrigan. 18 Parham bests Peay, 19 Clark clips Tyson. 21 Alberts bests Pittman; Erkmanis beats Youngquist, Pitman, Alberts and Mills, 22 Knuth nips Naylor. 23 Rugs rips Christion. 26 Anderson bests Summerville and Oursler but bows to Richter: Partlow licks Summerville. 27 Osadea mauls McCam, 2s Lidral licks Muller and Einstein.

Sections 30-49: 30 Sauvageau wins from Lacourciere. 31 Schofield jolts Johnson: Laird beats Bender. 33 Ribowsky tops Addelston. 34 Joyner jars Faivus and Horne: Polgar tops (f) Castelle. 35 Van Brunt bests Herman but bows to Ow: Schevrer halts Herman. 37 Gordon downs Potofsky, 38 Herdt conks Capper. 39 Van Lith licks Schmitt and Kelso. 40 Marks tops Fosner and ties Bochinger; Blochinger, Wright beat Bacharach. 42 Brown smites Smithers, 43 Duchesne downs Muir, 44 Coker withdrawn. 45 Chaffee chops McKaig. 46 Kleiman and Tuttle liek Lieberman. 47 Dobrich downs Meyer: correction: Dobrich won (f) from Meyers. 48 Von Hagel tops (a) Leibbrand. 49 Bischoff bests Lohrman.
Sections 50-69: $\quad \mathbf{~} 2$ Weithof wins from Huber. 53 Sibbett bests Vaughan and Vamamoto: Buchanan beats Carpenter. 54 Smith smites O'Neil, 55 Chinn chops Brown. 56 Dryfoos drubs Chiesa. 57 Vonglahn halts Blanchard. 58 Rock rips Tschopp. 59 Vonglahn ties Berger-Olsen and Wojtowic\%: Wojtowicz whips Wennerstrom. 60 Mcintyre tops Hansen; Yeller whips Wilson, 61 Fogg bests Parker and Bachman but bows to Gottesman; Gottesman downs Dickey, 62 Shortz licks Liming. 63 Ashley stops Stohlman; Shatutek loses to Ross but lfeks Willis. 64 Gustafson tops Austin. 65 Smithers beats Boynton; Brown licks Vallee. 66 Warren tops (f) Ferret. 67 Joslin jolts Bitl. 69 Balmuth bests Volkman and Elumetti.

Sections 70-84: 70 Ketterer. Reepmeyer tie; Rabinowitz bests Belt. 71 De Vore lies Levy and Gellish; Carpenter ties Levy but loses to De Vore. 72 Shulman tops RabinoWitz and ties Mantell. 73 Mantell beats Borden. 74 Bachman bests Groner. 75 Crown cracks DePaul; Deidun, Stayart tie. 76 Elowitch whips MacNeil. 78 Kalma withdrawn. 80 Strahan, Daniels down Hassempltug. 81 Munns bows to Oswald but beats Stulken. 82 Yehl whips Wagner and Comer: Kaplan ties Wang and tops Comer; Wang, Yehl tie. 83 Norin nips Jeans. 84 F . Brown bests Migicovsky and M. Brown but bows to Ozols and Paulekas: Ozols mauls Migicovsky.
Sections 85-99: 86 Sachs wins from Lerner and Ruiz. 87 Charney downs Hogendyk: Dreibergs bests Sparrow. 88 Pepper rips Rothman. 89 Morford licks Larrondo; Dragonetti nips Young. 90 Paulekas, Aderholdt best Villeneuve; Woods beats Bigler. 91 Lynn loses to Abrahamson and ties Carpenter. 92 Narkinsky nips Carrigan and Hawksley; Buczko bests Hawksley; Dickey downs Penniston. 93 Markiewicz stops Story. 9. Kaplan ties Kanzaki and loses to Leonard. 95 Saam beats Gilbert. 96 Graves grinds Glass: Feeney withdrawn. 97 Marschall bests Berres: Yee mauls Miller. 98 Bednary nips

Flaksman; Larzelere licks Macek, 99 Patteson mauls Marriott and MacGregor.
Sections 100-119: 100 Haralson loses to Bock but licks Gillmore. 101 Asbury bests Hoglund; Chippas, Foglund and Asbury hit Huber. 102 Tarbell tops Schat. 103 Cox conks Saas; Robertie rips Gens, 104 Martin mauls Orem. 105 Trone, Huckin. Daniels and Patteson mob MeCreight. 106 Nonella conks Camey; Mosoyer matls MeGowan; Pflumm nips Nonella and Carney, 107 Esposito axes Tripp; Sylvester whips Welling. 108 Duchesne downs Chapman. 109 Mayer. McGehee top Martin; MeGehee bows to Greer but bests Rovalty; Martin withdraws. 110 Steffen. Tripp manl Myers. 111 Fisch fells Weisman: Wood loses to Mantell and withdraws. 112 Orem tops Waller and ties Ashey. 113 Tomas tops Oswald. 115 Robertie, Collins stop Einstein; Collins conks A. Hamilton; correction: Robertie won from J. (not A.) Hamilton. 116 Hendrlcks bows to Senter but bests Cook; Jepson Jars Cook. 117 Appelblatt tops Jackson. Proudfoot and Hannold and ties Judson; Jackson Joses to Proudfoot but licks Hannold and Crabtree. 118 Klein clips Van de Carr, 119 Fitts beats Post but bows to Massengale; Jones, Post jolt Gebhardt.
Sections 120-180; 120 Holmes, Rapier tie; Schleidt tops Orem. 121 Capillon. Tage conk Hamilton; Robertie rips Page. 122 Pruitt Wisegarver, Orem, Sherman and Schleidt whip Sequeira. 123 Caserta bests Bodie. 124 Crum. Vondruska tie. 125 Joslin jolts MeKenna; Moore mauls Wells: LaBre withdraws. 126 Hujber ties Farber but loses to Neff. 128 Youmans yerks Vekert, 129 Hyde beats Ball and Collens; Costello withdraws. 130 Lane licks Gordon. 134 Blanchard eracks Criner. 136 Leinweber licks Winston. 137 Petithory pastes Parker: Einstein, Collins stop Paulekas, 138 Brand bests Blaney. 147 Weil replaces Lupienski; Schnelder downs Dustin, 149 Sholman fells Fagnoni and Brown. 131 Ward rips Roubik.

## SEMI-FINALS (Key: 65.-Ns)

Sections 1-7: 4 Rosenberg and Shaw replace Susswein and Elowitch.

## NEW POSTALITES

The following new Postal Chess players began in October with these ratings:
CLASS A at 1300: E Ambler, R Koppel, B $\llcorner$ Taylor and P M Unger:
CLASS B at 1200: J Alfassa, T A Bake, L Bolef, M Di Martino, F Ezell, D Farfaras, K R Feemster, S Finette, N E France, A W Hohner, R Icenogle, T M Lat, M Morris, M Nadler, G J Netter, R L Parks, T Stephens, I E Strauch, S Tennant and $T$ Varley;
CLASS C at 900: F M Barrett, R J Battle, $R$ Beach, $R$ A Blinckmann, $R S$ Bobiner, $J$ Cohn. T Cryer. A Dennehy, J M Devine. R L Ernest, P N Fisher, C E Franke, M D Gatinsky, M Greene, C B Hecox, J Hodes. 1 Hudak, A M Hvoslef, L Jayson, M D Kelley, R Lavallee, H F Leaper, D Lemay, D Mathews, $\quad P$ McIntyre, $R$ N Mc-
Lemore. $R$ C Meacham, P C Meili, $R$ Neri. $W$ Neville, $\mathbb{R}$ E O'Conner, J Pitts. H I Potter, A E Rackett, W Raschke, A Reeser, $R$ Rutherford, J Simon, B Sowetow, E Stansbury, W Staples, R L Stevenson, G Straus, M Tinker, A Verville, R M Weber. H Weiner, H P Willett, If A Yerke and J N Young;
CLASS D at 600: V C Agostine, J Bonde, W L Bradford, J J Cox, R L Criner, E De Luca, G Ellwood, R Friberg, J T Henniss, R H Herman, T E Johnson, $R$ Kennedy. w P Iittrell. D J Miller, R Murray. C W osborn. J C Ott, S Prando, G M Sherritt, $R$ M Smith, Anita Soik, E L, Telgmann, B Wildoner, R Winter and R L, Wolf.

## RETURN POSTS

The following old timers returned during October at these former ratings:
W Junge 1206; P M Loaano 1202; W Reudenbush 1568; $T$ Seidenfeld 1066; and C s weikel 998.

## POSTAL GAMES

 from CHESS REVIEW tourneysAnnotated by JOHN W. COLLINS

## Moot Sacrifice

Lacking a confession by the perpetrator, one is hard put to judge whether or not the Queen sacrifice initiated with 24 . . N-K6!? was deliberate or the result of a combination gone awry.

SICILIAN DEFENSE
V. Stack
M. Zitzman

Black
White
P-QB4
1 P-K4
P-KN3
Rejecting the more usual $2 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$, 2 . . P-K3 and 2 . . . N-QB3, Black adopts the Accelerated Dragon.
3 P-Q4
B-N2
4 P-QB3
....

White grasps the rare opportunity (in the Sicilian) to maintain a Pawn phalanx in the center.
Smyslov played 4 P-B4 against Botvinnik in their 12th World Championship Match Game, 1957.
On 4 PxP? Black has $4 .$. Q-R4 and $5 \ldots$ QxBP.

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
4 \ldots \times P & P \times P \\
5 \text { P×P } & P-Q 3
\end{array}
$$

Olafsson-Benko, Buenos Aires 1960, continued $5 \ldots \mathrm{~N}$-KB3 $6 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 47$ P-K5, N-K5 8 B-Q3, NxN $9 \mathrm{PxN}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ $=$

| $6 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{QB4}$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| $7 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| $8 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\ldots$. |

8 Q-K2 is more precise.

$$
8 \ldots \quad N-B 3
$$

An equalizing finesse is available in 8 ... NxP 9 NxN, P-Q4.
$\begin{array}{rl}9 & \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3 \\ 10 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3\end{array}$
B-N5
11 Q×B
$\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N}$
R-B1

The threat is 12 . . NxQP 13 BxN , RxB.

| 12 | B-N3 | Q-R4 | 14 Q-K2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 13 | KR-Q-Q1 4 |  |  |
|  | P-QR3 | 15 P-R3 | Q-B2 |
|  |  | 16 QR-B1 | $\ldots$. |

Now White threatens 17 NxP and 18 P-Q5.

| $16 \ldots$ | Q-N2 | 19 | P-K5 | N-R4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 17 B-R2 | N-QR4 | 20 B-R2 | P×P |  |
| 18 B-KB4 | N-B5 | 21 P×P | $\cdots$ |  |

And now White threatens to win the King Knight with 22 P-KN4.
$21 \ldots \quad \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3 \quad 23 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 4 \quad \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 3$

22 R-B2 $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 2 \quad 24 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1 \quad$. .
Not 24 BxN? PxB $25 \mathrm{RxP}, \mathrm{RxR} 26 \mathrm{QxR}$, R-B1 27 Q-K2, B-BS! as Black regains his Pawn with advantage.
(See diagram, top of next column)

$$
24 \ldots \quad N-K 6!?
$$

An imaginative move, which forks White's Rooks and cuts off the protection of his Knight, but it does not quite werk. 24 . . . N-N4 is probably best.

Position after 24 K-R1

| $25 R \times R$ | $R \times R$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 26 Q-B3! | $\ldots .$. |

In addition to declining the likely loss by 26 PxN? QxN, White guards his Knight, now really threatens 27 PxN and even menaces Black's Queen.

## 26

NxR
Black is forced to give his Queen for a Rook, a Knight and a mating attack. Or did he plan it this way?

```
27 N-B6 }
P×N
28 Q×Q
R-B8!
```

The threat is $29 \ldots$ NxBP mate!

| 29 | Q-N8 $\dagger$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 30 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{KN1}$ |
| 31 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 21$ |
|  | $\mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{P} \mathrm{\dagger} \dagger$ |
|  | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 5$ |

On 31 . . . B-B5 $\dagger 32$ P-N3, BxKP 33 Q-N7, White, threatening 34 QxP $4, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R1}$ 35 Q-N8 mate as well as 34 BxN , wins easily.

$$
32 \text { P-K6! }
$$

Now it is clear sailing.

| $32 \ldots \mathrm{~B} \cdot$ | PxP <br> 33 |
| :--- | ---: |
| $34 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3!$ | R 1 <br> Resigns |

Neat: if 34 . . . BxB, 35 QxN mate.
White re-acted perfectly to 24 . . . N-K6.

## Thematic Sacrifice

A thematic Rook sacrifice in the early middle game sparks a mating attack for White.

## QUEEN'S GAMBIT DECLINED

W. Meiden
W. McKaig

White
Black

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
1 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4 \\
2 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4 \\
3 & \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 3
\end{array}
$$

P-Q4
P-K3
If one wishes to essay the Exchange Variation it is best to play 3 PxP because a move later Black has the option of 4 . . . NxP.

$$
\begin{array}{lc}
3 \ldots \mathrm{~K} & \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3 \\
4 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5 & \ldots
\end{array}
$$

$4 \mathrm{PxP}, 4 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ and $4 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ are also good.
4 . . .
QN-Q2
5 P-K3
P-B3
$6 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$

Recognizing the equalizing power of the Cambridge Springs Defense, most masters avoid it with 6 PxP .

## $6 \ldots \quad$ Q-R4

And Black has his Cambridge-an adventure on the dark squares.

7 N-Q2!

But this capture is not the idea at all. 7 ...B-N5! 8 Q-B2, O-O [or now 8 ... PxP] 9 B-R4 [or 9 B-K2, N-K5 10 $\mathrm{N} / 2 \mathrm{xN}, \operatorname{PxN} 11 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 4=]$, P-B4! is consistent.

## 8 BXN

The annotator once won a postal game which ran 8 NxP?? QxB!

| $8 \ldots \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| $9 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| 10 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |

It seems illogical to desert the important post at KB3 and to neglect development.

$$
11 \text { B-Q3 B-N5 }
$$

On 11 . . . NxN 12 PxN, B-K2 13 $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} 14 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$, White has the stronger center.

| $12 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| $13 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $\mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{N}$ |
| $14 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 5$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q3}$ |

14 . . . P-KB4 is more practical.

$$
15 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4 \quad \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N}
$$

Again, 15 . . . P-KB4!

| 16 BPxB | Q-K2 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 17 Q-R5 | P-KR3 |

Black errs sadly. The best defense is $17 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KN} 318$ Q-R6, P-B3.


18 R-B6!
Logical chess. Black is denied the defensive resource of . . . P-KB4. A further buildup with 19 QR-B1, 20 QR-B3 and $21 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 3$ is envisioned. And the sacrifice of the King Rook for the King Rook Pawn is set up.

| $18 \ldots$. | PxR |
| :--- | ---: |
| 19 Q×P | P-KB4 |
| 20 R-B1 | $\ldots .$. |

$21 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3$ and $22 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 3 \dagger$ or $22 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 3$ now loom for a quick win.
$20 \ldots$
Q-K3
21 Q-R3
....
$22 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4$ is more accurate.

| $21 \ldots$ | Q-N3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 22 Q-R4 |  |

$22 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 4$ and 22 BxP may be better.

$$
22 \ldots \quad \text { R-K1 }
$$

Black can fight better after 22
$\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 2$ or $22 \ldots \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 5$.

| 23 | $R-B 3$ | K-B1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 24 | $R-N 3$ | Q-K3 |
| 25 | $B \times P!$ | $\cdots .$. |

This subsidiary sacrifice wins the Black Queen or mates.

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
25 \ldots & \text { QxB } \\
26 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} \dagger \dagger & \text { Resigns }
\end{array}
$$

26 . . K-K2 27 Q-Q6 is mate.
An instructive little game.

## Entertaining and instructive games

 annotated by a famous expert.

## INTERNATIONAL

## CIIBA 1965

## Capablanca Memorial at Havana Magnificent Technique

Black avoids first a slightly inferior endgame, then a somewhat risky middle game; but the upshot is that he lands in a definitely inferior endgame which he cannot hold against his opponent's magnificent technique.

It is a rare stroke of misfortune for Smyslov that he loses to both Ivkov and Fischer (page 316. October) in just that part of the game in which he normally excels.

## QUEEN'S GAMBIT DECLINED

Boris Ivkov Yugoslavia
White

| 1 P-Q4 | P-Q4 | 6 | B-B4 | P-K3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB4}$ | P-QB3 | 7 | P-K3 | B-Q3 |
| $3 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | 8 | BxB | QxB |
| 4 PxP | PxP | 9 | B-Q3 | O-O |
| $5 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | 10 | O-0 | B-Q2 |

The prevailing opinion up to a generation or so ago was that 10 P-QR3 followed by 11 . . . P-K4 offers Black a satisfactory game despite his isolated Queen Pawn. But times change. No recent examples back that opinion. Apparently, Smysloy disagrees. And the opinion of the former world champion, especially in regard to endgames, must be highly respected, in spite of his losing the endgame here as well as that with Fischer earlier (page 316. October issue).

| 11 | R-B1 | QR-B1 | 13 | B-N1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 12 | P-QR3 | N-QR4 |  |  |
|  |  |  | $14 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 5$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 5$ |
|  |  | $15 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{N}$ |  |

White has strong attacking chances on the Kingside after $15 \ldots$. PxN 16 P-K4: e.g. 16 . . . P-K4 17 PxP, QxKP $18 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 4 \dagger 19 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$.

16 P-K4!
Even now, White still plays for Kingside chances. He has a moderate edge.
(See diagram, top of next column)

$$
16 \ldots \quad \text { Q-B5 }
$$

The text makes matters worse for Black. He needs to proceed with 16 PxP 17 NxP, RxR [forced] 18 NxN , PxN 19 QxR with these possibilities:

1) $19 \ldots$ QxQP $20 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{QR5} 21$ P-QN3, Q-N4 or Q-B3 22 Q-R6, P-B4


Position after 16 P.K4!
$23 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ ! and White wins: e.g. 23 . . . P-B5 $24 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 3 \div$ :
2) $19 \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 120$ Q-R6, P-B4 21 BxP , and White wins;
3) 19

P-B4 20 Q-N5 $\dagger, ~ K-R 121$ Q-B6t, K-N1 $22 \mathrm{BxP}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 4!23 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 4$ ! and White ought to win;
4) 19 . . . K-N2! This is Black's best move. He still has a difficult game but does have a moderate chance of holding his own.

| 17 | P-KN3 | Q-N5 | $20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3!$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 18 | P-B3 | Q-R4 | 21 P -B4 |
| 19 | P-K5 | N-K1 | 22 KRxQ |
| QxQ |  |  |  |

As in his game against Fischer, Smyslov has landed in an ending in which he is handicapped from the start. He suf. fers here from an inferior Bishop, bad lodging for his Knight and, generally, lack of controlled terrain.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
22 \ldots & \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 2 \\
23 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3
\end{array}
$$

Smyslov looks to King-side counterplay. The plan finally fails, but there is hardly any line of better promise. Two alternatives are worth trying, though, both designed to avoid complete weakness on black squares on the Queenside: 23 . . . P-QR4 and 23 . . . B-N4 24 B-B2, P-QR4.

$$
\begin{array}{llr}
24 \text { K-K3 } & P \times P \\
25 \text { QP } \times P! & B-N 4 \\
26 \text { B-B2 } & B-B 5
\end{array}
$$

As Black's K3 lacks Pawn protection, 26 . . . P-QR4 loses by force: 27 NxB , NxN 28 B-R4, RxR [or 28 . . . N-R2 $29 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 7$ !] $29 \mathrm{RxR}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{R} 230 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7$ [also $30 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 7, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 231 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7!], \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 231 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 7$, and White wins.

$$
27 \text { P-N3 B-N4 }
$$

## EVERY SUNDAY <br> TOURNAMENT
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28 P-QR4
B-K1

Apparently, Black has provoked two Pawn moves in order to restrict the scope of White's Bishop on the Queenside. And now he aims to restrain the White Knight from reaching Q4: 29 N-K2, B-R4. All his measures, however, are merely stop-gap one. His basically unsound position cannot be redeemed.

| 29 | B-Q3 | B-R4 | 34 | P-R5! | K-B2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 30 | R-KN1! | KR-Q1 | 35 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{R} 4$ | R×R |
| 31 | K-Q4! | B-N5 | 36 | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ | B-B4 |
| 32 | R-B2 | N-K1 | 37 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 6$ | BxB |
| 33 | R/1-QB1 | P.KN3 | 38 | KxB |  |

Trading Bishops is a partial success for Black, but too late. White has meanwhile made decisive headway on the Queenside.


This move is insufficient-but under the circumstances very good. Black obtains strong counter chances, and white has to play very well to hold his edge. $39 \mathrm{PxP} \quad \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 3 \quad 41 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 4 \quad \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 5$ 40 P-R4 K-B4 42 R-B8! ...

This also is a fine move. Attack is the issue, and White retains the lead by trading Rooks. The point was not easy to see. Contrariwise, after $42 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3$, N-N2! Black's counter attack may become too strong.

$42 \underset{\mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{R}}{ } \quad$| $R \times R$ |
| ---: |
| $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 2$ |

On 43 . . . KxNP, White is first to promote a Pawn, as he is in the actual game, after $44 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 6!\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 245 \mathrm{NxP}$. Note that $44 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5$ is met by 44 . . . K-N5 $45 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 6, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$ !


For White gets yet another Queen: 59 KxN 60 Q-R1 $\uparrow$, K-B7 61 P-R6 etc.

## New Variation

White meets his opponent's contemp. uous . . Q-N3 in gambit style. Ob. aining fine attacking chances for a Pawn. Yet Black handily holds his ownill he blunders. The varjation is imporant and new (probably quite new) in ournament play.

## SICILIAN DEFENSE

| Robert J. Fischer <br> United States |  |  | Eldis Cobo |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Uuba |  |  |  |

This move is risky as is any when . QxQNP is a by-point.

## $9 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 5$

White accepts the challenge. For 9 B-QN5, see O'Donnell-Soltis, p. 384 .

| 9 | QxP |
| ---: | ---: |
| 10 N×B $\dagger$ | K-B1 |
| 11 N-Q5 | $\cdots$ |

In this much analyzed position, this is most likely White's best move.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
11 \ldots \ldots & \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{N} \\
12 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N} & \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{N}
\end{array}
$$

12 . . QxN is inferior, causing a traffic jam on the Kingside. The text is playable in view of 13 BxN ? Q-B6t or $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 5 \dagger$ : Black saves his Queen while White has uselessly yielded his Two Bishops.

## $13 \mathrm{O}-0$

Now White does threaten 14 BxN : e.g. 14 . . P PxB $15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q}^{4} \dagger$.
$13 \ldots$.
Q-B6
14 R-K1
Q-R4

Thus, the opening has become a promising gambit. White has fine compensation for his Pawn.

| 15 | Q-B1 | P-R4 | 18 | P-KB4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | P-R5

20 . . . P-N3 is no real improvement, and the highly artificial $20 \ldots$ KR-QN1 prevents White's sequel but is rendered insufficient by $21 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$ !


21 P-K5!
So far, White has merely been preparing; with this breakthrough, however, he starts to attack.

| $21 \ldots$ | QP×P | $24 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| $22 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $25 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| $23 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{RP}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 1$ | $26 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 6$ | $\cdots$ |

White threatens $27 \mathrm{BxP} \uparrow$. His attack is very strong.
26 . . .
QR-KB1

The text fails outright. Black must proceed with 26 . . KR-KB1 27 QR-K1, QR-K1. Then Black is in a critical posi. tion. but it is not certain that he must lose.
27 QR-K1!
R-B2
28 RxKP!
. . .

Apparently, Black failed to foresee this eventuality.

| 28 | Q-N6 | 31 | QxP $\dagger$ | Q×Q |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $29 \mathrm{BxP} \dagger$ | K-R3 | 32 | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Q} \dagger$ | K-N2 |
| $30 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 1 \dagger$ | P-KN4 | 33 | R-KB1 | RxR |
|  |  | 34 | BxR |  |

Now White wins easily, two Pawns up with the Pawn on R5 sure to fall, despite the Bishops of opposite colors.


## Two Rounds to Go

Ivkov was solidly entrenched in first place with two rounds to go. He could fall out only by losing both his remaining games. Here's how he managed for the penultimate game.

## QUEEN'S GAMBIT DECLINED

| Gilberto Garcia <br> Cuba |  | Borislav <br> Yugoslavia |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| White |  |  |

So far so good, or so bad-just how one chooses to regard it. White misplayed the opening, fell into lamentable difficulties, then put up a tough resistance but landed still in this position.


Black is the Exchange and three Pawns up and needs only a draw to clinch first prize in the tournament. But, of course,
he cannot offer a draw in a position in which practically any move wins. So he plays on.

$$
\begin{array}{lrr}
36 \ldots & \text { P-Q6 } \\
37 \text { B-B3 } & \text { Resigns }
\end{array}
$$

Black has put his King en prise, so to speak. Mate is inevitable. against the conqueror of Smyslov and Fischer. Such a sensation could occur only once in a blue moon.

## Iv's Ifs Off

A lot of ifs had pointed to Ivkov's being the sole winner of the tournament. None remained after this last-round game. Winner Robatsch did well in the tournament as a whole and rises here to an extra-fine performance of the quiet, positional type.

## RUY LOPEZ

| Borislav Ivkov |  | Karl Robatsch |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Yustria |  |  |

Here the game deviates from FischerKholmov in which $17 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5$ was played.

$$
17 \ldots \mathrm{P} \mathrm{\times B}
$$

In this type of position, White normally has chances for a King-side Pawn storm, provided he retains absolute control of his K4, preferably by posting his Bishop or Knight there. In this particular position, White's chances for such a Pawn storm are actually very dim.

$$
18 \ldots \underset{N}{19} \mathbf{N} 5
$$

KR-K1
Not 19 NxP because of 19 $\qquad$ 20 QxN, B-Q3.
$19 \ldots$
$\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 1$ !
This Knight is to take the critical squares, Black's K5 and Q6, under fire. Remember: White must control his K4! $\begin{array}{lllll}20 & \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3 & \mathrm{QN}-\mathrm{Q} 2 & 22 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N} & \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B} \\ 21 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4 & \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 4 & 23 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} & \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}\end{array}$ 21 P-QR4 $\begin{array}{lll} & \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B4} 4 & 23 \mathrm{PxP} \\ & & 24 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 4\end{array} \quad \mathrm{PxP}$.

Here white errs, achieving nothing but a weakening of his Queenside. 24 $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 4$ is correct, with about even chances after $24 . . \operatorname{NxN}$ as well as after 24 . . N-Q4 25 P-KN3 [25 P-B6 is dubi. ous because of $25 \ldots$ P-N3].

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
24 . \text { KR-Q1 } & \text { B-N3 } \\
25 & \ldots
\end{array}
$$

Here is another error, and an even more serious one. With $25 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 4$, White ought. still to be able to hold.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
25 \ldots \ldots & R \times R \dagger \\
26 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R} & \cdots
\end{array}
$$

Or 26 RxR, P-K5! 27 NxKP, NxN 28 BxN, Q-K4 also with a winning advantage for Black: e.g. $29 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1, \mathrm{QxP} / 630$ $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3$ ! or $29 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{QxQ} 30 \mathrm{BxQ}$. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B} 31 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 6, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 8 \dagger 32 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 2, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$ !


In thus gaining control over the key square K5 (or White's K4), Black obtains a decisive advantage.

$$
\begin{array}{llll}
27 & \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5 & 29 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 6 \\
28 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 4 & \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 4 & 30 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B} & \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{N}
\end{array}
$$

In this endgame, White is hopelessly handicapped by his inferior Pawn struc. ture.
$32 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B1}$
33 BxP
$\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 4$

Now, with connected, passed Pawns, Black wins easily although it takes some time.
34 R-R7
K-B1
35 P-Q5
R-Q1!
36 P-B6

Note the amusing situation after 26 R-N7, NxP 37 RxP, N-B6 in which every one of White's three pieces is in peril.

| 36 |  | PxP | 48 | P-R5 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N8}(\mathrm{Q})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 37 | P-B3 | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | 49 | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Q}$ | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| 38 | R-N7 | P-B4! | 50 | K-K2 | R-B7 $\dagger$ |
| 39 | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 1$ | P-N5 | 51 | K-Q1 | N-R6 |
| 40 | K-B2 | P-B5 | 52 | R-R4 | R-QR7 |
| 41 | Bxp | P-N6 | 53 | P-N5 | P-B6 |
| 42 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 4$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B6}$ | 54 | P-R6 $\dagger$ | K-R1 |
| 43 | R-N4 | R-Q7 $\dagger$ | 55 | R-R8 $\dagger$ | K-R2 |
| 44 | K-K1 | R-Q8 $\dagger$ | 56 | R-KB8 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B7}+$ |
| 45 | K-B2 | R-QB8! | 57 | K-Q2 | R-R8 |
| 46 | P-R4 | K-N2 | 58 | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P} \dagger$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 1$ |
| 47 | B-B5 | P-N7! |  | Resigns |  |

## ISRAEL 1965 <br> International Tournament at Natania

## Hope amidst Intricacy

This brilliant performance by tournament winner Czerniak is remarkable also for its intricate nature. During the crucial stage of the game, dazzling num. bers of questions arise with almost every move. The bombarded annotator can only hope to have found some of the good answers.

## ROBATSCH DEFENSE

| B. Soos |  |  | M. Czerniak |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Israel |  |  |  |

Here as in similar positions, White must guard constantly against the fork by $6 \ldots$ NxP: e.g. $7 \mathrm{NxN}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q4}$ as well as the forking break by 6 . . . P-Q4. Either leaves him but one Pawn in the center. Neither was disturbing at the
moment, but anticipating both by the text does no harm. $6 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 3$ also serves the same purpose.

6
P-B3
The break by 6 . . . P-Q4 is met by 7 PxP, NxP 8 O-O. Then attempt to harass White's Queen fails: $8 \ldots$ N-B5 9 Q-K4, B-R3 $10 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 411$ QxNP: Likewise, attempt to swap off White's King Bishop (possible if the Queen Pawn were insufficiently protected): 8 N-N3 9 B-N3, BxP? 10 NxB, QxN 11 QxP! As in most similar positions, 6 . . QN-Q2 is even worse, because of 7 P-K5 and a later P-K6.


## 7 B-N3

7 P-K5 is uselessly committing, and Black can choose 7 . . . N-Q4 or 7 . . PxPfirst. The latter is weak when \& NxP is playable but that fails here against 8... QxP. The text guards further against 7. . P-Q4. but the correct precaution is $7 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$. Then 7 ...P-Q4 8 B-Q3 slightly favors White, and so does 7 . . Q-B2 8 P-K5! which timely prevents 8 . . . P-K4 and allows White $8 . \operatorname{PxP} 9$ NxP! or $8 \ldots$.. N -Q4 9 PxP; or $8 \ldots \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 19$ O-O; or $8 .$. N-R4 9 P-KN3.

| $7 \ldots$ | $Q-B 2$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $80-0$ | $\cdots$ |

Despite White's lost tempo, he does better preventing 8...P-K4 by 8 P-K5.

| $8 \ldots$ P | P-K4 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 9 P×P | P×P |
| 10 N-B4 | QN-Q2 |

Black has a good game. He threatens to make headway by

P-QN4 or $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B4}$.

## 11 P-B3

White cannot parry both threats perfectly but does have better moves,
$11 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q1}$ gives White a good game on 11 . . P-QN4 12 N-Q6: e.g. 12 N-B4 13 NxKP! It gives him a fair game on 11 . . . N-K1 12 B-K3, P-QN4 13 N/4-Q2, N/1-B3 14 P-KR3, N-R4 15 R-K1: e.g. 15 . . . N-B5 $16 \mathrm{BxN}, \mathrm{PxB}$ 17 P-K5, N-B4 $19 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 4$. But Black gets a good game by $11 \ldots \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 4$ ! e.g. 12 N/4xP, NxB 13 RPxN, R-K1.

11 B-N5 allows White's Queen Knight, to retreat without hampering this Bishop. A plausible line then is 11 P-QN4 12 N/4-Q2, $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 413 \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{E} 3$, P-KR3! 14 BxN, BxB 15 B-B2, N-K? with a slight edge for Black.
$\begin{array}{lr}11 \text { N-QN4 } \\ 12 \text { N/4-Q2 } & \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{R4} 4\end{array}$
Already, Black takes the initiative.

| 13 | P-N3 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | 15 | Q-K3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 14 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5$ | 16 N-N3 | Q-K2 |
|  |  |  | 17 | P-QR4 |
|  |  | $\ldots$. |  |  |

White prevents . . . P-QB4-5 and seeks Queen-side counterplay but actual. ly needs every tempo to strengthen his King-side defenses. With Pawn holes on KB3 and KR3, the normal defense is 17 $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 2$ and $18 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 1$. It is White's best here.
17 . . .
Q-B3! 18 B-Q1
....

It is too late for $18 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 2$ as 18 $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R} 3$ then wins.

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
18 \ldots & \text { QR-Q1 } \\
\text { Now the threat is } 19 \ldots & \text { RxB! } \\
19 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 2 & \ldots . .
\end{array}
$$

Again, the Knight resumes its mal_ function as a roadblock. $19 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 2$ fails because of 19 . . . RxB $20 \mathrm{RxR}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R} 3$ ! 21 Q-Q3 or $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{BxB}$ with threat of 22 . . . N-B5 $\dagger$ etc.

$$
19 \ldots \quad N / R-B 5!
$$



This routine sacrifice strongly sug. gests itself on general principles, and an exact check on all its consequences is hardly possible over the board. The Black attack gains greatly in momentum.

## 20 PxP

Some of the plausible variations after 20 PxN, NxP follow.

1) $21 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3$ ! and Black wins.
2) $21 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3$ ! $22 \mathrm{QxP}, \mathrm{RxN}$ ! and Black wins: e.g. $23 \mathrm{BxR}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 7 \dagger$ etc. or $23 \mathrm{NxR}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 4!$ etc.
3) 21 QxP. and it is not easy to decide on Black's best. A strong continu. ation is $21 \ldots \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 6+22 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 2, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3$ :
a) $23 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KN} 1, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 5 \dagger 24 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1, \mathrm{BxB}$ $25 \mathrm{RxB}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 4$ and Black wins;
b) $23 \mathrm{PxP}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 6 \quad 24 \mathrm{PxP}, \mathrm{BxN} / 725$ $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B} 26 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 5 \dagger 27 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 4$ 28 R-KN1, Q-R4. In this position, Black threatens 29 . . QxP† and mate next. And he wins on $29 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{RxN}$ ! etc. or $29 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 3$, Q-Q8 $\div 30 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 1, \mathrm{RxN}$ ! and, if 31 Q-K3, QxR $\dagger$ etc. Finally, on 29 Q-Q7, RxQ [not $29 \ldots$ RxN 30 Q-N4] 30 PxR , R-Q1 31 R-R7, Q-K7, Black must win. His attack is still too strong; one of his threats is $32 \ldots \mathrm{~N}$-Q6.

| 20 K-R1 | B-R3! |
| :--- | ---: |
| 21 R-Q6 |  |
| 22 Q×P | N-R6 |

With no piece down, Black has an easy job compared to the lines above.

| 23 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N} / 7$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| $24 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ |  |
| $25 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{N} / 3-\mathrm{N} 4!$ |  |

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

Black can afford time for . . . PxP, yet comfortably keep his initiative. But the text is finer and intriguing.


26 P-KB4
White tries a desperate counter action and only demonstrates the hopelessness of his position.

After 26 PxP, Black must avgid the tempting $26 \ldots$ RxN which leads only to perpetual check: $27 \mathrm{BxR}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 6 \dagger 28$ $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 6 \div 29 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 2, \mathrm{QxP} \ddagger 32 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1$. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 8 \div 33 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 6+34 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1$ as Black has nothing better than to keep on checking.

The true point of Black's last move is $26 \ldots$ Q-K3! with threat of $27 \ldots$ $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 5 \dagger$ etc. or, when appropriate, $27, \ldots$ NxKP, $27 \ldots \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 6$ and $27 \ldots$ Q-N5. The respective variations are easy.

| $26 \ldots$. | KPXP |
| :--- | ---: |
| 27 R-B1 | $R / 1-Q 1!$ |
| 28 P×KBP | $\ldots$. |

White's altematives are just as bad.

1) $28 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 1, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3$ or $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6 \div 29$ $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 1, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 7$ and the threat of 30 Q-B6 mate wins.
2) $28 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6 \div 29 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1$, NxKP.
3) $28 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{RxN} 29 \mathrm{RxR}, \mathrm{NxR}$ and 30 $\mathrm{KxN} / \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 4 \dagger 31 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 2, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6 \dagger$ etc. or $30 \mathrm{KxN} / \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{PxPs}$ and $31 \mathrm{KxP}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 6 \dagger$ or $31 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 2$, PxRP $32 \mathrm{KxP}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5$ etc.

| $28 \ldots \ldots$ | $R \times N \dagger$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| $29 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B} \dagger$ |
| $30 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ | $\mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{KP}$ |

The rest plays itself.

| 31 | Q-N8 $\dagger$ | K-N2 | 34 | K-B1 | Q-N5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 32 | R-B3 | N/5-B7 $\dagger$ | 35 | Q-K5 $\dagger$ | K-R3 |
| 33 | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | Q-R5 | 36 | R-N3 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ ! |
| The real threat is $57 \ldots \mathrm{R}$. B 7 mate. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 37 | Q-K3 | R-Q8 $\dagger$ | 40 | QxN | $N \times Q+$ |
| 8 | R×R | QxR $\dagger$ | 41 | K-B2 | Q-K7 $\uparrow$ |
| 39 | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{QxP} \mathrm{\dagger} \dagger$ |  | Resigns |  |


"] do wish you'd subscribe to Chess Review, Mother, instead of always running off with my copies."

## ROUMANIA 1965 <br> Students Team Championship at Sinaia

## Symbolic Name

Dominant in this event were the victorious Russians and, somewhat surpris. ingly, the Israeli who finished second. Yoingster Kagan is in a way symbolic as his name is the Russian form of Cohen.

In this game, White's attack is du. bious at the beginning; but, with a bit of co-operation, it develops into a hurricane of brilliancy.

SICILIAN DEFENSE

| Kagan |  |  | Nordstroem <br> Israeli |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  | Sweden |
| White |  |  |  |  |

Black starts action at this early stage -very risky.

$$
10 \text { P-B4 P-QN4 }
$$

Black lays a threat on White's King Pawn.

## 11 P-B5

Now white also takes chances. 11 Q-K2 is the steady continuation, threatening 12 P-K5: e.g. 11 . . . NxB 12 RPXN, P-N5 13 P-K5! with fine attacking chances for White.

$$
11 \ldots N \times B
$$

The alternative 11 . . . P-K4 $12 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ favors White.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
12 \mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{N} & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 5 \\
13 \mathrm{~N} / 3-\mathrm{N} 5 & \ldots .
\end{array}
$$

This sacrifice is dubious, but there is no good alternative. On 13 N -QN1, Black safely wins the King Pawn.

$$
13 \ldots \quad Q-N 1
$$

Now White is able to get a steady attack without sacrificing a piece, 13 ... $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 2$ is correct. It threatens $14 \ldots \mathrm{PxN}$ and, by protecting Black's QB3, stops White's tactical stroke which follows in the game. Finally, 14 PxP, PxN allows White but moderate compensation for the piece.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 14. P-K5 ! } & \text { QPxP } \\
15 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 6! & \ldots . .
\end{array}
$$

Here is the decisive point. As Black must protect against 16 Q-Q8 mate, White's other Knight escapes with good effect.

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
15 \ldots \ldots & \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 3 \\
16 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 6 \dagger & \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N} \\
17 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B} & \cdots \cdots
\end{array}
$$

Now the threats are both 18 Q-K7 mate and $18 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
17 \underset{\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 5}{ } \quad \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 4 \\
18 & \cdots
\end{array}
$$

Now, of course, the threat is RxN. 18 18 . . . B-Q2
Black counters by threat of 19 QxN (in answer to 19 RxN ).

19 PxP PXP<br>20 R-QB5 R-QB1<br>(Concluded on page 384)

## IN A WOODEN

 CHESS SET YOU WILL FIND NO BETTER BUYThan

## THE CRAFTSMAN

A Superb Chess Set



ARE you looking for a wooden chess set of distinguished design, exacting workmanship and longlasting durability -at a reasonable price? If you are, then The Craftsman is the set for you.
Its pieces are shaped in the graceful lines of the famous Staunton pattern, in a smoothly finished wood, called Tsugeone of the finest and most expensive in Japan-and are perfectly weighted for balance at the base, which is felted with billiard cloth. The King is $31 / 2$ inches high, with a $13 / 4$ inch base; and the other men are in the true Staunton proportions.
The pieces, which come in deep black and sleek yellow, are beautifully turned out and carved. A particularly lovely detail is the wonderful carving done on the Knights-in the best tradition of famed oriental workmanship.
This outstandingly good-looking set is boxed attractively in sturdy Nara wood, favored for furniture and flooring because of its durable qualities.
Striking to look at and perfect for chess play, this set is a lifetime buy at an amazingly reasonable price!

Catalogue No. $26 \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots . . .$|  |
| :--- |
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42, Tebi 52, Westbrock 113, Larsen 207
Birsten v Itkin 285 Bobrinsky v Rekka $\quad 160$
Boouwmeester v Padevski 44, Petrosyan 72
Botvinnik v Donner 136, Aloni 145, Trifunovich 171, Gligorich 274, Alatorzev 299, Schmid 318, Tartakover 329

Boucher v Walrath 156 Brigmanis v O'Donnell 188 Brandts v Pineo 191, 192 Brasket v Callinan 369 Bronstein v Bakulin 95, 138, Kholmov 104
Browne v Soltis 63, Marchand 190
Brunner v Shainswit 338
Burger v Benko 268
Byrne, D. v Pfleger 126
Byrne, R. v Benko 19, Di-
trichs 64, Benko 319
Callinan v Brasket 369
Chace v O'Donnell 89
Cherubim v Orth 300
Cherry v Frithiof 313
Cobo v Fischer 379
Cole v Wilson 156
Cukierman v Tartakover 41
Czerniak v Kraidman 21. Soos 380
Ditrichs v Byrne 64
Doe v Joyner, Agree 346, Taylor 347 .
Donner y Botvinnik 136
Dumont v Saint 156
Dunham y Goodspeed, Hendricks 156
Eidlin v Shmatkov $\quad 156$
Eliskases v Portisch 50
Evans v Bielicki 8, Padevsky 17 , Udovchich 18 , Reshevsky 189
Fattman v Winkler 256

Feuerstein v McCormick 94
Fischer y Smyslov 316, Lehmann 317, Cobo 379
Foguelman v Petrosyan 112
Forman v Freeman 285
Fowkes y Heinoo 219
Freeman v Forman $2 \$ 5$
Fricker v Nestler $\quad 300$
Frithiof v Cherry 313
Garcia v Anderson 222, Ivkov 378
Gedult v Mazzoni 244 Geller v Lengyel 106, Pach. man 108, Smyslov 200, 221 Spasski 232, Smyslov 234, Spassky 288
Gheorghiu v Stein $\quad 266$ Ghitescu v Reshevsky 126 Gipslis v Honfi 300 Gligorich v Vranesic 7, Keres 189, Ivkov 247, Schmid 273, Szabo, Botvinnik 274
Goldin $v$ Ambarian 96
Goodspeed v Dunham, Hoglund 156
Gore Y Benko 269
Goregliad v Hoffmann 267 Gragger v Madan 148 Grant v Wildenberg 235 Grefe v Mengarini 320 , Robey 340
Gregorieff v Alekhine 33c Gresser v Lazarevich 16 Gufeld v Klovan 36
Hahn v Baldwin 188
Hanauer v Mugridge $\quad 15$ Heinoo v Fowkes 219
Helder v Smith Hendricks v Dunham 156 Hess $y$ Kent Heubner v Kurajicha 328 Hiber v Polillo Hochberg y Kleinich 26 Hoffmann v Petroff $\quad 7$ Hoffmann, A. v Goregliad 267 Hoglund v Kehler 61. Goodspeed 156

| Honfi v Gipslis | 300 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Hoppe v Suttles | 20 |
| Horton v Ratcliffe | 244 |
| Hujber v Schwab | 26 |
| Itkin v Birsten | 285 |

Ivkov v Vasyukov 18, Gligorich 247, Larsen 301, 303, 349, Smyslov 378, Garcia, Robatsch 379
Jarvis v Pullen
Joyner v Doe
Kagan v Nordstroem
381
Kalish v Manning
211
Katz v Rosenberg
Kaufman $v$ Seidman
223
Kavalek v Bisguier
42
Kehler v Hoglund
61
Kent y Hess
61
Keres v Saidy 31, schmid 78, Littlewood 94, Walther 148, Spassky 168, Gligorich 189, Spassky 220, 221
Khanov v Liashkov 160 Kholmov v Bronstein 104 Kleinich v Hochberg $\quad 26$ Klovan v Gufled 96 Korchnoy v Peterson 175,

Pfleger 336
Kort v Trifunovich 173 Kraidman $\forall \quad$ Czerniak 21, Szabo 27, Schmid 144, Bednarski 146
Kupper v Petrosyan 49
Kushnir v Teodorescu 124
Kuypers $v$ Portisch 80
Larsen v Trifunovich 172, Matanovich 206, Bisguier 207, Tahl 296, Ivkov 301, 303, 349, 363 ff, 367
Lazarevich v Gresser 16, Zatulovska 74, 75
Lehmann v Fischer $\quad 317$
Lein v Unzicker 367
Lengyel v Geller 106, Barcza 244, Pfleger 337
Levy v Shipman 235
Liashkov v Khanov 160
Liberson v Petrosyan 159
Littlewood v Keres 94
Lombardy v Rauch 208, Seid.
man 236, Mengarini 339
Machine v Opponent $\quad 180$
Madan v Gragger 148
Malich v Ballinas $\quad 144$
Manning y Kalish 211
Marchand v Browne 190
Marshall $v$ Subarew, Rabino.
vich 14, Mugridge 15
Matanovich v Portisch 109, Latsen 207
Mazzoni v Gedult 244
McCormick v Feuerstein 94 Mengarini v Grefe 320, Lom. bardy 339
McKaig $v$ Meidon 377
Meiden v McKaig 377
Metger v Bernstein 22.4
Morton v Smith 294
Movshovich v Bagirov 160
Mugridge v Marshall, Hanauer 15
Najdorf v Stein 266
Nestler v Fricker 300 Nordstroem v Kagan 381
O'Donnell v Chace 89 , Brigmanis 188, Soltis 384
O'Hearn $v$ Thompson 123
O'Kelly v Unzicker 17
Olland $v$ Wolf
15
Opocensky v Steiner $\quad 7$
Opponent v Machine 180
Orth v Cherubim $\quad 300$
Pachman v Geller 108, Portisch 145
Padevsky v Evans 17, Boouw. meester 44, Uhlmann 248
Panno v Pilnik
267
Peacock v Stayart 156
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Peterson y Korchnoy } & 175 \\ \text { Petroff }\end{array}$
Petroff v Hoffman
Petrosyan v Reshevsky 28, Kupper 49, Boouwmeester 72, Fognelman 112, Liberson 159, Taimanov 174, Portisch 246 Pfleger v Stein 80, Byrne 126, Korchnoy 336, Lengyel 337 Pilnik v Panno 267
Pineo v Brandts 191, 192
Ploss v Stonkus 156
Polillo v Hiber 89
Polugayevsky y Uhlmann 202, Suetin 204

Pomar v Unzicker 127, Porath 222
Porath v Pomar 222
Portisch v Eliskases 50, Kuy-
pers 80, Matanovich 109,
Pachman 145, Petrosyan 246,
Tahl 264, 333, 334, 348, 361
Pullen y Jarvis $\quad 313$
Purdy $v$ Vaughan 92
Rabinovich $v$ Marshall 14
Ratcliffe y Horton 244
Rauch v Lombardy 208
Rekka v Bobrinsky 160
Remeniuk v Stein 96
Reshevsky v Petrosyan 28,
Ghitescu 126, Evans 189
Robatsch v Ivkov $\quad 379$
Robey v Grefe 340

Rosenberg v Katz
256
Rubinstein $v$ Teichman 115
Saidy r Keres
Saint $v$ Dumont
Salwe v Schlechter 31

Salwe Schlechter 183
Scheffer y Schwartz 219
Schlechter v Salwe 183
Schmid v Keres 78, Kraidman
144, Gligorich 273 , Botvinnik 318

| Schwab v Hujber | 26 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Schwartz v Scherfer | 183 |
| Seidman v Kaufman | 223, |
| Lombardy 236 |  |
| Shainswit v Brumner | 338 |
| Sherwin v Valvo | 62 |
| Shipman v Levy | 235 |
| Shmatkov v Eidlin | 160 |

## INDEX OF OPENINGS

Some openings may occur under more than one section: e.g. King's Indian Defense: $1 \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ under 4; 1 N-KB3 under 5 .

$2 \begin{array}{r}\text { SINGLE KING PAWN } \\ 1 \text { P-K4; no } 1 \ldots \text { P-K4 }\end{array}$
Alekhine Defense 303,363 ,
365
Caro-Kann Defense 7, 19, 80 ,
95, 127. 138, 172, 264, $320,333,348,369$
French Defense 18, 33c, 46,
$49,123,156,159,203,334$
King's Indian Reversed 19
 $23 \mathrm{x}, 268 \quad 269, \quad 286$
Robatsch Lefense 16, 14b, 204, 238, 269, 274, 286, Sicilian Defense $7,17,29$, $44,61,64,74,79,94$, $96.104,109,112,124$, $156,160,173, \quad 219, \quad 223$, $244,266,267,285,2 S 8$, $296,300,317,328,339$, $346,366,367,368,369$, 377,379 . 381, 384

## DOUBLE QUEEN PAWN 1 P-Q4, P-Q4

Albin Counter Gambit $\quad 370$ Queen's Gambit

Accepted $15,61,125$,
$160, \quad 175, \quad 210, \quad 246.274$ Declined $\quad 50,72,10 \mathrm{~S}$,
115, 126. 150, 191, 192,

| 256, | 288, | 299, | 377, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 378, |  |  |
| Slav Defense | 160, | 222, |  |
|  | 303, | 349, | 378 |

4SINGLE QUEEN PAWN 1 P-Q4; no 1 ... P-Q4
Benoni Counter Gambit 21 ,
$42, \quad 145,248,337, \quad 367$
Blackmar-Diemer Gambit 156,
Blumenthal Defense $\quad 367$
Colle System 156
Indian Systems
Gruenfeld Defense 51, 76. $92,123,189.200$, 221, 369
King's Indian Defense 18 . $28,31.92,148,171,202$,
$219,223,236,273,314$.
$318, \quad 319.329 .336,349$,
363,367
Neo-Gruenfeld Defense 33 S
Neo-Indian Defense 10
Old indian Defense 144, 336
Nimzo-Indian Defense 27 ,
168, 174, 220, 221, 234,
236, 247, 266, 288, 300, $346,318,300,361$
Queen's Indian Defense 17, 41, $52,220,349$
Pirc Defense 207
Queen Pawn Opening 26, 156
Robatsch Defense 207
Stonewall System 188


## Silvester y Vianna

Smith, T. v Morton

Smyslov v Benko 30, Unzicker 78, Geller 200, 221, 234, Fischer 316, Szabo 336, Ivkov 378
Soltin v Browne 63, O'Donnell 384
Soos v Czerniak $\quad 380$
Spassky v Bialas 79, Keres 168, 220, 221, Geller 232, 288
Stack v Zitzman 377
Stayart v Peacock 156
Stein v Bisguier 29, Pfleger 80, Remeniuk 96, Najdorf, Gheorghiu 266

Stonkus v Ploss 156 Subarew Y Marshall 14 Suetin y Tahl 114, Uhlmann 203, Polugayevski 204
Suttles $v$ Hoppe
20
Szabo v Kraidman 27, Gligorich 274, Smyslov 336

Tahl v Benko 19, Suetin 114, Portisch 264, Larsen 296, Portisch 333, 334, 348, 361, Larsen 363ff, 367
Taimanov v Petrosyan 174
Tarrasch v Tchigorin 91
Tartakover $v$ Cukierman 41,
Botvinnik 329
Taylor y Doe
347
Tchigorin v Tarrasch 91
Tebi v Bisguier 52

7 Teichman v Rubinstein $\quad 115$

Teodorescu v Kushnir 124 Teschner v Barendregt 317 Thompson v O'Hearn 123 Thorpe v Adams 369 Trifunovich v Botvinnik 171, Larsen 172, Kort 173

Udovchich v Evans 18
Uhlmann v Yanofsky 51, Polugayevski 202, Suetin 203, Padevski 248
Unzicker y O'Kelly 17, Smyslov 78, Yanofsky 80, Pomar 127, Anderson 147, Lein 367

Valvo v Sherwin $\quad 62$
Vasyukov y Ivkov 18, Bakulin 340
Vaughan v Purdy $\quad 92$
Vianna v Silvester $\quad 149$

Vranesic v Gligorich $\quad 7$
Walrath v Boucher $\quad 156$
Walther v Keres 148
Weiss v Bjornsson 92
Westbrock v Bisguier 113
Westwall v Winterton 369
Wildenberg v Grant 235
Wilson v Cole 156
Winkler v Fattman 256
Winterton v Westwall 369
Wolf v Olland 15
Woods v Ashley 156
Yanofsky v Uhimann 51, Unzicker 80
Yoffie v Benko 236
Zatulovska v Lazarevich 74, 75
Zitzman y Stack


Or 21 . . . BxN 22 QxPt, K-Q1 23 $\mathrm{RxN} \dagger$ with mate to follow.

| $22 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{P} \dagger$ | K-N1 |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 23 | QxB | R-B1 |
| 24 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 8$ | Resigns |

## UNITED STATES

## NEW YORK 1965 New York City Junior Championship

## Treacherous Poin's

In this last round encounter between two rivals, when White refuses to make

## Solutions to CHESS QUIZ

A 2 R-K8\%, B-B1 3 RxBt, KxR 4 N-B5§, and mate next.
B $2 \mathrm{RxQ}[2 \mathrm{QxR} / 2$ not so clear because of 2...RRPi 1 , and $2 \ldots$ RxQ $3 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 8 \dagger$, followed by 4 NXN, or $2 \ldots$ BxR 3 QxR/2 etc.
$\mathrm{C} 2 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ and, if $2 \ldots$ Q-B3, $3 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 8 \dagger$.
D 1... B-R3 at least wins White's Queen. $\mathrm{E} 1 \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3 \dagger 2 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 8 \dagger$ leads to mate. F $1 \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3 \dagger 2 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B} \dagger$ leads to mate. G 2 BxRP六, NxB 3 RxN, KxR 4 R-R4 $\frac{1}{1}$, K-N1 $5 Q$ or R-R8 mate, or 2 RxP etc.
H 2 RxN $\frac{1}{1}$, RPxR 3 R-R4, any $4 Q$ or R-R\& mate.
12 N-K6 [2 P-K6 also leads to mate]: and 2 . R $/ 3 \times N 3$ BxRPi, NxB 4 R-N4 4 . $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 45 \mathrm{Q}$ or R-R8 mate; or $2 \ldots$ BxN 3 BxRP 4 , NxB 4 RxN. KxR 5 R-R4 4 ete.
$\mathrm{J} 1 \ldots \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B5} 2 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 4, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 8 \div 3 \mathrm{BxQ}$. N-Q6§ $4 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7 \dagger 5 \mathrm{QxR}, \mathrm{RxQ}$ mate.
K $1 \ldots$ N-K6t and mate next.
L $1 .$. N-K6 $+2 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 8 \dagger 3 \mathrm{BxQ} . \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 8$ mate.
M 1 . . N-K6 $\dagger^{\dagger} 2 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} \mathrm{B}_{\dagger} 3 \mathrm{BxQ}$. R -B8 $\dot{\mathrm{C}}^{4} 4 \mathrm{RxR}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 7$ mate.

For 13 correct solutions, score yourself excellent; for 10, good; for 7, fair.
it a gambit, Black makes it one himself. His Pawn sacrifice, though of a familiar type, has some treacherous particular points, too. White's failure to realize so entails quick disaster.

## SICILIAN DEFENSE

| Michael O'Donnell |  |  | Andrew | Soltis |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 P-K4 | P-QB4 | 5 | N-QB3 | B-N2 |
| $2 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB3}$ | N-QB3 | 6 | B-K3 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| 3 P-Q4 | PxP | 7 | B-QB4 | P-Q3 |
| 4 NXP | P-KN3 | 8 | P-B3 | Q-N3 |
|  |  | 9 | B-QN5 |  |

9 N -B5 is an enterprising gambit continuation which Fischer played in the Capablanca Memorial Tournament.
$9 \ldots \quad \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2 \quad 11 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2 \quad \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 1$ 10 Q-Q2 B-Q2 12 P-KN4 O-O

It requires good nerves to castle at this moment, but tournament winner Soltis has them.

## 13 P-KR4

P-QN4!
Black fires his secret weapon, a Pawn sacrifice which offers strong counterplay in several variations. The threat is 14. . NxN $15 \mathrm{BxN}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 5$ and, if 16 BxN, PxN!

$14 N / 4 \times P$
14 P-R3, P-QR3 holds no promise especially as White intends to castle long and so doesn't want to weaken his Queen-side Pawns.

So he accepts, but that is worse. His way of taking is apparently comparatively safest, but it is this way which has a particularly treacherous point.
$14 \mathrm{~N} / 3 \mathrm{xP}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 215 \mathrm{NxN}, \mathrm{RxN}!16$ $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ allows White to hold his own for the time being but still defending against a strong positional gambit, And 16 NxRP ,
$\dagger=$ check $; \ddagger=$ dbl. check $; \$=$ dis. ch.
$\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 3$ gives Black superior play especial. ly inasmuch as $17 \mathrm{BxR}, \mathrm{QxB}$ costs White his Knight and allows him no chance of using his connected, passed Pawns effectively.

On 14 BxP, NxN 15 BxN , BxB 16 NxB , Q-N2! Black threatens both $17 \ldots$ QxN and 17 . . . NxKP, and 17 N-B3 fails against 17 . . . P-K4! 18 B-K3, QxNP. So White lacks an adequate defense.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 14 \ldots 0 \\
& 15 \text { O-O-O }
\end{aligned}
$$

Q-N2

White has relied on the text, but Black was waiting for it. There may be comparatively better moves, but there is hardly a satisfactory one. On $15 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3$, Black proceeds as in the game though with lesser effect.


Here is Black's treacherous point. His primary threat is actually what now happens. White is lost.
16 P-R3
BxN
$17 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$
....

Or 17 PxN, RxN 18 PxR [on 18 BxB , Black plays . . . RxB!], Q-R3! 19 $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 2, \mathrm{BxB}$ and Black wins.
18 .... $\quad$ R×N!

Or again, if 18 PxN, RxB etc.

| $18 . \ldots$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{R} 7 \dagger$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| $19 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1$ | $\mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{KP}$ ! |
| 20 PxN | $\ldots .$. |

White hasn't even a possibility of giving up his Queen for moderate compensation.


For, after $22 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1, \mathrm{BxB}$, even 23 Q-N4 only delays mate but briefly.

## Pstal SS WII

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

## 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.

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

## Saves You Money

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


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

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY
BTATE

CHESS REVIEW's (1966) Eighth United States Open

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

THE current edition of the Golden Kinights tournament is now under way, and entries are acceptable until November 30, 1966. It is conducted under CHESS REVIEW's Rules and Regulations for Postal Chess, as mailed with assignments, and with the special rules given below.

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

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

## Special Rules for the 1966 Golden Knights Tournaments.

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

1 CHESS REVIEW's 19th Anntal Golden Knights Postal Chess Championship Tournament is open to all persons living in the continental United States of America and in Canada, except CHESS REVIEW's employees, contributing editors and members of their families.

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

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

4 All contestants who score 4 or more game points in the preliminary round will qualify for the semi-final round. Similarly, all qualified semi-finalists who score 4 or more game points in the semi-final round will qualify for the final round. If additional players (from 1 to 6 ) are required to complete the last section of the second or third round, these players will be selected from among contestants who scored $31 / 2$ points in the previous round and in the order of their CHESS REVIEW Postal Ratings at the time the last section starts.

5 Except as provided in Rule 4, contestants who score less than 4 points in elther of the qualifying rounds will not be eligible for the announced cash and emblem prizes. Each of these eliminated contestants, however, upon completion of all his scheduled games in this tournament, will receive one free entry (worth $\$ 1.75$ ) into a CHESS REVIEW Postal Chess Class Tournament and can apply, instead, for entry to a Prize Tournament (worth $\$ 3.25$ ) at $\$ 1.75$ only,

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

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

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

9 The entry fee is $\$ 4.50$ and entitles the contestant to compete in one section of the preliminary round. No additional fee is charged contestants who qualify for the second or third rounds. A contestant may enter any number of sections of the preliminary round upon payment of the fee of $\$ 4.50$ per section entry provided he applies early enough so that we can place him in separate sections. Multiple entries by one person will compete and qualify as though made by separate individuals. No contestant, however, may win more than one prize, and a player who qualifies for more than one section of the final round will be awarded his prize on the basis of the total score achieved by only one of his entries. (The entry making the highest total score will be taken.) Multiple entries will be placed in different sections of each round.
10 Upon entering, each contestant agrees that the decision of CHESS REVIEW and its Postal Chess Editor in all matters affecting the conduct of the tournament, including the acceptance and classification of entries, the adjudication of games, the award or refusul of forfeit claims, the distribution of prizes and all interpretations of the rules and regulations, shall be final and conclusive.

11 Single entries can be mailet now and until November 30, 1966 (multiple entries until wo months hefore Nov. 30). Entries mailed after that date may not be accepted.
12 Except as provided in the foreazoing riles and in all other respects, this tournament will be conducted under CFDDSS REVIEW's Official Rules and Regulations of Postal Chess, inchuding any amendments or additions thereto.


# $\$ 1000.00$ IN 75 CASH PRIZES 

FIRST PRIZE . . \$250.00 Second Prize $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 0}$ |Sixth Prize $\$ 40$ Third Prize $\quad \$ 80$ Seventh Prize $\$ 30$ Fourth Prize Fifth Prize $\quad \$ 50$ Ninth Prize $\$ 25$ Tenth Prize $\$ 15$<br>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 rumning! Entries accepted from De-- cember 1, 1965 to end of November, 1966 (must bear postmark of no later than November 30, 1966).

This is the 1966 Golden Knights

## PRIZES FOR EVERYBODY - EXCEPT DROPOUTS.

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

And even if you fail to qualify for the finals, you still get a prize! If you are eliminated in the preliminary or semi-final round, but complete your playing schedule, you will receive one free entry (worth $\$ 1.75$ ) into our regular Class Tournament or can enter our regular Prize Tournament (entry worth $\$ 3.25$ ) on payment of only $\$ 1.75$. First and second in each Prize Tournament win a $\$ 6$ and $\$ 3$ credit respectively for purchase of chess books or chess equipment.

FOR SPECIAL RULES
SEE OTHER SIDE
for the winners of the first five places in this national event, as well as the Golden Knights emblems.

## OPEN TO ALL CLASSES OFPLAYERS

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 $\$ 4.50$. You pay no additional fees if you qualify for the semi-final or final rounds. But you can enter other first round sections at $\$ 4.50$ 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

Check bere if you are a new. comer to Postal Chess. Start me as CLASS
I enclose $\$ \ldots . .$. . Enter my name in ......... (how many?) sections(s) of the Nineteenth Amnual Golden Knights Postal Chess Championship Tournament. The amount enclosed covers the entry fee of $\$ 4.50$ per section.

Print Clearly
点
$\square$ Check bere if alveady a reg.

Name

## Address


[^0]:    $\dagger=$ check; $\ddagger=$ dbl. check; $\S=$ dis. ch.

[^1]:    * Games 1, 4, $6 \& 10$ on pp. 363-6, and 10 with Euwe's comments also on p. 296, Oct.

[^2]:    Old high grade ivory statue chess set-mandarin carved with great detail-appraised and insured for $\$ 750.00-35 \mathrm{MM}$ slides will be sent on bank reference-offers requested Box 4916 , Sacramento, California 95825.

[^3]:    *Weighted point totals are based on the following scale: 1.0 points per win in the prelims; 2.2 in semi-finals; and 4.5 in finals. Draws count half these values.

[^4]:    * All tiumber references indicate page numbers: monthly issues end with following numbers: Jan. 32, Feb. 64, March 96, April 128, May 150, June 192, July 224, Aug. 256, Sept. 288, Oct. 320, Nov. 352. Items appearing on covers when indexed are listed with number of facing page (counting such, total pages run to more than 384);
    $c$ indicates cover page nearest to page number indicated; f(ff) indicates pages(s) following on same item.

