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THOSE who saw Pillsbury in action considered him the greatest blindtold player who eyer lived. It was not from the number of boards he faced (or more properly, turned his back to) but for the ease and grace with which he mentally manipulated his pieces throughout even the most bewildering complications.

In his day, it was customary for even the best of blindfold artists to give displays of their skill on eight or ten boards. To Pillsbury, an exhibition on sixteen boards was a routine affair. It is from one of these sixteen game performances that we select this beauty which cleserves to be rescued from the Department of Neglected Masterpieces.

Vienna, 1902
H. N. Pillsbury

White

| 1 | $P-Q 4$ | $P-Q 4$ | 6 | $B-Q 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2 | P-QB4 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | $7 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{KP}$ |
| $3 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B3}$ | $8 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}$ |  |
| $4 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $9 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |  |
| $5 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | 10 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |

The position has a distinctly modern look, which is not to be wondered at as Pillsbury played the sort of chess which never gets out of date.

| 11 | O-O | N-N5 | 15 | B-N5 | N-B3 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 12 | R-K1 | P-KR4 | 16 N-K5 | O-O-O |  |
| 13 | P-KR3 | Q-K2 | 17 Q-B3 | K-N1 |  |
| 14 | P-B5 | B-B2 | 18 P-QN4 | B-B1 |  |
|  |  |  | 19 KR-Q1 | $\ldots$. |  |

The proper way to protect the Pawn. White's Queen Rook is to be used to support the advance of his Queen Knight Bawn. Meanwhile Black must not snap at 19 . . RxP $20 \mathrm{RxR}, \mathrm{BxN} .21 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ is the refutation.

| $19 \ldots-\operatorname{R}$ | K-R1 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 20 QR-N1 | B-N1 |
| 21 P-QR4 | R×P |

Black sacrifices the exchange to get some freedom for his pieces. Better that than to be slowly cushed to death.

| 22 | $R \times R$ | $B \times N$ | 26 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| B-R2 | N-Q4 |  |  |
| 23 R-QB4 | $B-N 1$ | $27 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| $24 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 5$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $28 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $25 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $29 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 4!$ | $\ldots$. |

A pretty move which threatens 30 RxN .

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
29 \ldots \mathrm{R} 4! & \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 1 \\
30 \mathrm{R} / 4-\mathrm{N} 4!
\end{array}
$$

Of course not $30 \ldots$ NxR 31 BxPt .

| 31 | $R / 4-N 2$ | $P-N 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 32 | $B \times N$ | $P \times B$ |
| 33 | $Q-B 6$ | $R-Q B 1$ |
| 34 | $P-B 6!$ | $Q \times P$ |
| 35 | $B \times P$ | $B-B 2$ |

There is no relief in $35 \ldots$ BxB 36 QxB/5, Q-K1 $37 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5$, followed by 3 N $\mathrm{F}-\mathrm{R} 6$ and $39 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 7$.

| 36 | BxB | QxB | 39 | R×R | KxR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 37 | Q-Q4 | Q-Q3 | 40 | P-R5 | K-R1 |
| 38 | R-N7 | R-88 $\dagger$ | 41 | R-N1 |  |

There is a little threat of $42 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{RS}\rangle$.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
41 \ldots-B 2 \\
42 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 6 & \text { Q-B2 }
\end{array}
$$

Now White aims at $43 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 7$.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
42 \dot{Q}-\dot{K} 5 & Q-B 3 \\
43 & Q-B 1
\end{array}
$$



44 Q-Q6!
The quiet move which forces resignation. The threat of $45 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 87, \mathrm{QxR} 46$ Q-B6 5 , followed by mate can be stopped only by $44 \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$, but then $45 \mathrm{R}-$ N8t, QxR 46 QxPt leads to the same finish.
It is worth repeating that this was one of sixteen blindfold games played simultaneously!

THEERE is a quality of simple relinement about this ending of Selman's which is extremely attractive. White is to play and win:


## 1 K-R5

Planning to win the Bishop by the zigzag route- $2 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 6$ and $3 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 7$.

| $1 \ldots$ | B-N2 | 3 | $K-B 7$ | $B-Q 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 2 | $K-N G$ | $B-B 1$ | 4 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5$ |$\quad \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 1$

In the second ending, by Bron. White is to play and draw. It won't spoil the story to tell you that the last move is a stunning surprise.


Threatening mate on the move.

1 P-K4
B-Q6 $\dagger$
Q-Q1
The best defense.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 3 \text { R-R5 } \dagger \\
& 4 \text { B-Q5 } \dagger
\end{aligned}
$$

K-N1
Apparently White has an easy draw, as he wins the Queen after $4 \ldots \mathrm{~K}$ - B1 $5 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 8 \dagger$.

$$
4 \ldots
$$

## QxB

Black gives $u$ his Queen: White's Pawn is pinned, and, if $\overline{5}$ RxQ. BxPi 6 R-B5, P-R6, and Black wins.

## 5 R-R8†!!

$\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{R}$
And White draws by stalemate: This and thousands of other beautiful last-minute rescues are a powerful argument against abolishing the draw by stalemate

Another ending by Selman which has it morbid touch specilies that White is to play and draw.


This is how the solution runs:

|  | B-K6 $\dagger$ | P-N5 | 3 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 5^{\dagger}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | BxR | PxB | 4 | Q4 | P-A |

Or $4 \ldots$ PxP and White is stalemated.

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
5 & \text { K-N1 } & \text { P-N6 } \\
6 & \text { P-B3 } & \text { P-N5 } \\
7 & P-B 4 & \ldots . .
\end{array}
$$

And now Black is stalemated. Curious how Black's King is buried alive:

## THOUGHT FOR THE MONTH

There is no other game so esteemed. so profound and so venerable as chess: in the realm of play it stands alone in dignity.-Ely Culbertson.
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# Readers are invited to use these columns for their comments on matters of interest to chessplayers. 

## ENCOMIUM

Several times in the past couple of years, the arrival of Chess Review has prompted me to a letter about what a good level the magazine has achieved. The letter was never written because I always thought I would meet you and could tell it better, etc.
This time shall not pass. The February issue, like many a one before it, cannot be read without a letter of gratitude to the editor. I remember well the small beginnings; so I appreciate doubly the finest chess magazine in English. I do not read Baluchinstanic or Afghanistanic; so I must qualify about languages.

Your annotators, Horowitz, Kmoch and Reinfeld, are the greatest group writing for any English magazine. In the few others I get, Euwe is the only one comparable to your boys.
Your departments have been imaginatively conceived. I know of several one-opening players who have been jolted out of their ruts by the clear and thorough and practical discussions of opening play in Spotlights. One of whom I know in detail is Cook. I now fumble with the Sicilian instead of confining my fumblings exclusively to the French Defense.

Kmoch's summary of the play of masters in the Amsterdam Tournament was a wonderful and revealing story. The only comparable work I know is Euwe's Meet the Masters-and Kmoch was infinitely more limited in space. He gave me an illuminating insight into the style of several comparatively new players, and I will enjoy their games more in the future. We near-sighted enthusiasts in chess must be told what to look for.

I am sending him a note suggesting a story on Tartakover. [See page 72 of this issue!-Ed. 1 Kmoch must have a wide collection of data and anecdotes on the man. A brief anecdotal biography with a summary of his opening play (if such eccentricity can be summarized) would
make the piece I most want to read just now. I think a lot of other players of my caliber (the majority) would share my anticipation. Tartakover and Euwe now are the only very active masters who go back to the start of the era between the two World Wars, which, in view of present political conditions, is likely to be the Golden Era of Chess for a long time to come. Present, former and future champions are not meeting so freely right now.
Getting back to Chess Review, it gives me insight into the personality of players month after month. I know the chess style of Rubinstein (thanks to the book and all of his games you published). "Only a Draw" in the February issue was full of clues to the personality of the man. That was very gratifying.
How to Win in the Opening and Readers' Games, I have approached with a feeling of superiority. Then I found those pieces simplified odd points for me and I was just beginning to get the fundamentals of details which I thought I had mastered. You are conducting an easy post-graduate course for players who think they already are among the wisest men on earth.
You have a magazine now which gives me all the varieties of what I want: Chess Movies, Solitaire Chess and diagrammed positions for reading in the can; opening analysis, good games and personality pieces on master players, as I have detailed before. If you had started your magazine a few years earlier, I think I would have achieved my present deplorable position in chess much sooner than I did. I now believe that, in all the vast population of these United States, there are just about 12,341 players below my strength. I intend to hunt all of them down, beat them and fortify my present lowly position. So what if $150,000,000$ are full of better players than $I \mathrm{am}$.

Alton Cook
New York, N. Y.

[^0][^1]
## The Biggest Bargain in Chess Literature!

# CHESS REVIEW ANNUAL 

Volume 18

A
LL twelve issues of Chess Review published during 1950 have been handsomely bound in cloth to make this jumbo-sized, 384-page book. In it are 312 games, selected and annotated by experts, from the most important chess events of the past year.

These include the International Team Tournament at Dubrovnik, the World Championship Challengers' Tournament at Budapest, the U.S.A.Yugoslavia Radio Match and many other important chess events.
In addition, the volume contains articles on historical and modern chess subjects and thoroughly annotated games by Collins, Horowitz, Kmoch, Reinfeld and other masters.

For up to date knowledge on the theory of chess openings, the series by Fred Reinfeld, Spotlight on Openings, is indispensable. For solid instruction on the basic elements of opening play, editor I. A. Horowitz' How to Win in the Openings should be treasured permanently. Chess Caviar and Chernev's Chess Corner display the brighter side of chess. There are tests of your chess skill, and rafts of cartoons, pictures and other articles and stories.
This is by far the biggest. bargain in chess literature. \$6.

## Order Your Copy Now! <br> CHESS REVIEW

250 West 57th St., New York 19, N. Y.


DE LUXE timing device in handmade American Black Walnut case ( $43 / 4$ " x $21 / 2^{\prime \prime} \times 3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ ), with leatherette covered carrying case, operates anywhere with stop watch accuracy. One year guarantee. $\$ 20.85$ plus $10 \%$ Fed Tax.
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## SCARBOROUGH, 1927

PCO: page 234, column 5 COLLE SYSTEM
E. Colle

Sir G. A. Thomas
White

| 1 | P-Q4 | N-KB3 | 3 | P-K3 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2 | N-KB3 | P-K4 | 4 | B-Q3 |

The idea is to hinder White from subsequently playing PxBP (after . . . P-B4) and P-K4.
5 QN-Q2
P-B4
6 P-B3
B-Q3

The Bishop is usually needed at K2. $70-0$

O-O
After 7 P-K4 8 P-K4! White opens the game to his advantage.

$$
8 \text { P-K4! } \quad \text { QP×P }
$$

Black cannot continue the policy of imitation:

I $8 \ldots$ QPxP $9 \mathrm{NxP}, \mathrm{NxN} 10 \mathrm{BxN}$, P-K4 11 PxKP, NxP 12 NxN, BxN 13 BxP $\dagger$ winning a Pawn.
II 8 . . . P-K4 9 PxKP! QNxP (9 . . . BxP would cost a Pawn) 10 NxN, BxN $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4$ with advantage.

| 9 NxP | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $11 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathrm{P} x \mathrm{P}$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 10 BxN | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | 12 PxP | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 3$ |



White gave himself an isolated Queen Pawn in order to obtain compensating attacking chances. Black should have answered $12 \ldots$ Q-N3 with pressure on the Queen Pawn.

$$
13 \text { B-N5 }
$$

B-R3
After the more obvious $13 \ldots$ B-N2, White could play $14 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3$ (14 . . $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 5$ ? 15 QxB winning a piece) $15 \mathrm{KR}-$ K1 with advantage.

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
14 \text { R-K1 } & \text { R-B1 } \\
15 \text { N-K5 } & \text { B-K2 }
\end{array}
$$

Black has had to play the Bishop to this square after all. It is true that White was not yet threatening 16 BxN , QxB $17 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 7$ because of $17 \ldots \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 3$; but, sooner or later, Black would have to relieve the pin in view of the threatened $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 3-\mathrm{KB} 3$ or $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 3-\mathrm{KR} 3$ and, if necessary, $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 4$.


18 B-R4!
Finely played: Black's Queen Bishop "hangs" in variations to $20 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$.

| $18 \ldots$ B-N3 | P-QN4 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 19 B-B1 |  |

Or 19 . . . N-Q4 $20 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 3$ with advantage (White was threatening 20 NxBP!). $20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5$ !


20 . . P P-R3
This costs a Pawn, but otherwise:
I 20 . . . B-K2 21 NxBP! KxN 22 RxP regaining the piece with two Pawns to the good ( $22 \ldots \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 423 \mathrm{RxB} \dagger$, RxR 24 Q-B3 $\dagger$ ).

II 20 . . . B-KN2 $21 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 4$ (to prevent N-N4) 22 QR-K1, R-B2 23 Nx NP! PxN 24 RxP and wins; or $22 \ldots$ K-B1 23 NxBP! KxN 24 RxP winning.

III $20 \ldots$ B-QN2 21 Q-K2! P-QR3 22 NxBP! KxN 23 RxP winning.

| 21 BxN | Q×B |
| :--- | ---: |
| 22 R-KB3 | Q-R5 |
| 23 R×P | Q-K5 |
| B3 was threatened. |  |
| 24 Q-K1!! | B-QN2 |

There was no better reply to White's ingenious move:

I $24 \ldots$ Q-R5 $25 \mathrm{RxB} \dagger, \mathrm{RxR} 26 \mathrm{NxP}$ winning easily.

II $24 \ldots$ Q-R1 25 Q-N1! wins.
III $24 \ldots$ QxP $25 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 7$, Q-KR5 ( $25 \ldots$ QxP $26 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 1 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 627 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 4 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{KN} 228$ $\mathrm{RxB} \dagger) 26 \mathrm{NxP}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 327 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 4$ and wins.

| 25 Q×Q | B×Q |
| :--- | ---: |
| 26 R×P | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 7$ |

In order to get a Rook on the seventh rank; but Colle's attack comes first (after he has made a loophole for his King!).
27 P-N3 BxB 29 R-QN7! RxP
28 PxB KR-Q1 30 QR-R7 R-B8 $\dagger$
$31 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 2 \quad \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7$
Now follows a piquant finish.
32 NxP
R/5-Q7
33 NxB !
....

Not 33 R-KB7, RxPi! $34 \mathrm{RxR}, \mathrm{RxR} \dagger$ $35 \mathrm{KxR}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 4 \dagger$, etc.

| $33 \ldots$ K-R3 | RxP $\dagger$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| 34 | P-R4 |
| 35 K-R4 | Resigns |

White forces mate in a few moves.
Notes condensed from Fred Reinfeld's 51 Brilliant Chess Masterpieces.
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## Mikhail Botvinnik <br> World Champion

## INTERNATIONAL

## World Championship!

The chess championship of the world is at stake this month. On March 15, World Champion Mikhail Botvinnik begins a 24 game match with David Bronstein, the FIDE-designated challenger.
The first to score $121 / 2$ or 13 points ( 1 point per won game; $1 / 2$ point for draw) will be the winner; and Botvinnik will retain his title if the match is drawn. Play is to be in Moscow at the rate of 3 games a week; 40 moves in the first $21 / 2$ hours; 16 moves each hour after; with adjournments to the next day after 5 hour sessions.

Karel Opocensky will be referee. According to his Bulletin International des Injormations Echiqueennes (Prague, Czecho-Slovakia), each player has seconds; Botvinnik's is V. Ragozin; Brontein's, A. M. Konstantinopolsky (who may have absorbed a good deal of Botvinnik's chess artistry from the classic trouncing administered to him by Botvinnik at Sverdlovsk, 1943).

## Botvinnik's Record

The champion's record is essentially as given in Chess Review-in 1948!

TOURNAMENT RECORD

| Year | Tournament Rank | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| '26 | Leningrad Ch'ship ........2-3 | 7.2 |
| '26 | N. W. Russian Ch'ship | 61 -31 |
| '27 | Leningrad Masters ........... 2 | $7 \frac{1}{1}$-2 |
| '27 | 5th USSR Ch'ship .........5-6 | 122.12 |
| '29 | Leningrad | 1112-21 |
| '29 | 6th USSR Championship Preliminary Sec'n Semi-final Sec'n | $\begin{aligned} & 7-1 \\ & 21 \end{aligned}$ |
| '30 | Leningrad Master ............ 1 | $6 \frac{1}{2}-1 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| '31 | Leningrad Ch'ship | 14.3 |
| '31 | 7th USSR Ch'ship | 1312-31 |
| '32 | Leningrad Ch'ship | 10 - 1 |
| '32-3 | Leningrad Masters | 7 -3 |
| '33 | Leningrad Masters .........1-2 | $10-3$ |
| '33 | 8th USSR Ch'ship ........... 1 | 14.5 |
| '34 | Leningrad | 82-31 |
| '34-5 | Hastings | 5.4 |
| '35 | Moscow Internatio | 13.6 |
| '36 | Moscow International ....... 2 | 12.6 |
| '36 | Nottingham ................1-2 | 10.4 |
| '38 | Semi-finals, 11th USSR Champ'ship |  |
| '38 | AVRO ............. | 712.61 |
| '39 | 11th USSR Ch'ship .......... 1 | $12 \frac{1}{2}-4 \frac{2}{2}$ |
| '40 | 12th USSR Ch'ship ${ }^{\text {den }}$ | $112.7{ }^{2}$ |
| '41 | USSR Absolute Ch'ship ...... 1 | 132-63 |
| 1.43 | Sverdiovsk | $10 \frac{1}{21}$ |
| '43 | Moscow Ch'ship | 13 -21 |
| '44 | 13th USSR Ch'ship | $12 \frac{1}{2}-3 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| '45 | 14th USSR Ch'ship | $15-2$ |
| '46 | Groningen ........ | 1412-41 |
| '47 | Moscow International | 11.4 |
| '48 | Hague-Moscow .............. 1 | 14-6 |

Total Score: 328.119 Percentage: $73.38 \%$
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Add his two wins vs. Arnold Denker in the 1945 USA-USSR radio match, a win and a draw with Samuel Reshevsky in the USA-USSR match, Moscow, 1946, a win and a loss with C. H. O'D. Alexander, USSR-Great Britain radio match, 1946. Yet his peak performance is the 1948 World Tourney (see table below).


## Bronstein's Record

A point by point count of Bronstein's tournament and match successes would not be as impressive as Botvinnik's-nor a fair comparison-as he is 13 years younger. In the highlights, however, we see a curious parallel to and some portents against the champion. Like Botvinnik, Bronstein won the title of master at 16 -when he won the championship of the Ukraine. In USSR championships, Bronstein finished in the lower half on his first try in 1944-but even so he won from Botvinnik (he has $11 / 2$ in the two encounters in which they met!)-and he then placed successively as third and sixth and twice after tied for first (with Kotov and with Smyslov). But Botvinnik did not participate in the later events, and the USSR championships appear to be almost rat-races in his absence. So the peak of Bronstein's performance lies in his ascent to challenger: he won first place at Saltsjobaden (Interzonal Tournament) 1948, and with it a clear right to the title of grandmaster (see table below) ; and he tied Isaac Boleslavsky for first in the Challengers' Tournament at Budapest, 1950 (see Chess Review, page 163, June, 1950) ; and then he won the gruelling play-off match, $71 / 2 \cdot 61 / 2$ (see Chess Review, page 291, October, 1950).

Bronstein's record in international team matches does not quite equal Botvinnik's. Whereas the champion played board one in all three, Bronstein defeated A. E. Santasiere twice at board ten in the 1945 USA-USSR radio match, won one and lost one with Olaf Ulvestad at board ten in the USA-USSR match, Moscow, 1946, and split likewise with W. Winter at board seven in the USSR-Great Britain radio match, 1946. In the Moscow-Prague match of 1946 (Botvinnik did not play) Bronstein scored $101 / 2-11 / 2$ at board one.

## The Outcome?

Botvinnik has been hailed as "superman" and "invincible," and he has imponderables on his side in his title and his impressive record. But that record stops at 1948! His ability is truly great-to judge not only by his record but by actual analysis of his play (see World Chess.
masters in Battle Royal). Still even his great showing at Groningen, 1946, was marred by a loss to a youthful adversary, D. A. Yanofsky of Canada.

Larry Evans, with an admiration inspired during the production of his David Bronstein's Best Games, favors the challenger. So does the Russian grandmaster Kotov who weights heavily Bronstein's 13 year advantage and his greater participation both in contests and in study in chess since 1948.
At 39, Botvinnik is hardly old-as chess players go-but his recent inactivity may hurt. And Bronstein's $11 / 2 \cdot-1 / 2$ against him is counter-weight to awe of the titleholder. Will Botvinnik's experience and steadiness under fire prevail? Will Bronstein's youthful ardor and recent sharpening? Or does one excel the other in basic technique and natural aptitude? We cannot guess. But we shall soon see.

## OTHER INTERNATIONAL EVENTS Havana Ho!

Headed by Dr. Reuben Fine and captained by Dr. Edward Lasker, a team of seven representing the Marshall Chess Club of New York traveled to Havana, Cuba, to lock horns with the matadors of the Capablanca Chess Club.
The result was a $31 / 2-31 / 2$ tie, with Fine and Edgar T. McCormick turning in wins for New York, and Jose R. Florida and Allejandro accounting for the Havana victories. The other three games were drawn, including the encounter between Alexander Bisno, president of the Manhattan Chess Club (reportedly shang. haied by the Marshallites), and Aureliano Sanchez-Arango, Cuban Minister of Education. This game was said to have been the most exciting (see page 80 ).

| 1 Fine ............ 1 | Planas |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 Lasker ......... | Aleman .......... $\frac{\text { a }}{}$ |
| $3 \mathrm{Kmoch} \mathrm{........}. \frac{3}{2}$ | Broderman |
| 4 Mengarini ...... 0 | Florido |
| 5 McCormick ..... 1 | Bucelo |
| 6 Bowman ....... 0 | Meylan |
| 7 Bisno .......... $\frac{\text { za }}{\text { a }}$ | Sanchez-Arango |

Prior to the match, Fine played five clock games simultaneously, defeating Ortega, Cobo, Estenzer and Calero and drawing with Gonzalez.


## Słudents' Holiday

A team of nine students from British Universities toured Holland and gained triumphs against Amsterdam, Beverwijk and Leyden University by scores of $51 / 2-31 / 2,61 / 2-21 / 2$ and $9-0$ respectively.
In the main contest, however, when the English encountered the combined strength of the Dutch Universities, they lost a double-round match by $71 / 2-101 / 2$. At the top board, L. W. Barden of England broke even with his powerful opponent, J. H. Donner.

## - UNITED STATES

## NATIONAL EVENTS

## United States Championship

The United States Chess Federation reports that the biennial U. S. Championship (postponed from 1950) is scheduled now for the summer of 1951. It will be held in New York, probably a little after the U. S. "Open" Championship. The latter will be at Fort Worth, Texas, July 9-21.

As reported last year (see Chess Re. view, page 132, May, 1950), this biennial is the last such. Hereafter a three year program of preliminary (regional) and "candidates" and final championship tournaments will be in effect.

The (1951) biennial tournament amounts to a change-over event and, as such and without preliminaries havin ${ }_{i}$ been held, it is an invitation tournament. Arrangements are under the U. S. Championship Committee, G. E. Roosevelt, chairman.

## WASHINGTON

Another victory was notched by Seattle city titleholder Charles K. Joachim, $51 / 2-1 / 2$, when he captured the 1951 Washington State Open Championship, a 37 . man, 6 -round Swiss event. Attendance at this tournament broke all Washington records.

Charles Ballantine, with a $5-1$ game score and a $211 / 2$ S.B tally, was runnerup, while Floyd Hebert, $5 \cdot 1$ and 19, placed third. Next came Kenneth Mulford and Robert C. Stork, each with a game score of $41 / 2-11 / 2$ but taking fourth and fifth respectively on a S-B basis.

Game scores of $4-2$ were made by the following players, who finished in the order named on S-B points: Carl Enz, H. E. Yocom, F. H. Weaver, Glenn Muller and Owen Traynor.

George Rehberg was Publicity Director and C. Bushnell directed the tournament.

## LOCAL EVENTS

California. Adding once more to its string of scalps, the Pomona Chess Club took the measure of the San Bernardino Chess Club by a 7.0 sweep.


Jack W. Collins
Participant in the $W$ orld Correspondence Chess Champion Finals, was runner-up in the Marshall Chess Club Championship.

Illinois. Among the stops made by Chess Review editor I. A. Horowitz in his recent country-wide tour was his stay as a guest of the Decatur Chess Club at the Orlando Hotel, where he gave a lecture and a simultaneous exhibition on 16 boards. Gerald Garver, president of the club, drew his game.

Albert Sandrin, former United States Open Champion, was another notable visitor at Decatur. Entertaining the members of the Decatur Chess Club in the home of the secretary, Mrs. Turner Nearing, Sandrin delivered a lecture based on a discussion of positions taken largely from his own games.

Still another event at the active Decatur Club was a 13 -board simultaneous display by Paul Adams, director of the Illinois State Chess Association, given in the interest of a membership drive for the ISCA. Hugh Myers, the sole winner, received as his prize a free ISCA membership. Draws were credited to Dr. Max Schlosser, Dr. Arthur Berger, Lyndal Baumgardner and Albert Sandrin. Inclusion of the last-named in the line-up
greatly added to the interest of the per-formance-and, no doubt, to the difficulties of the single player.
Michigan. In the Midland Championship Tournament, an 8 -man round robin, Charles Starnes, 5-2, won the city title, ahead of Bob Broad, $41 / 2-21 / 2$, and Bruce Dieter, 4-3.

The Saginaw Valley League trophya "little brown jug" appropriately decorated with a chess motif-was captured by the Midland players for the second consecutive year when they trounced the Flint Chess Group in a play-off, 6-2. Midland winners were Dr. W. R. Mullison, Al Brauer, Bob Broad, Charles Starnes, Frank Micklich and Walt Cepela. Victors for Flint were J. J. Reddy and Ed Muller.
New York. It was Milton Hanauer's year of triumph in the $1950-1951$ championship tournament of the Marshall Chess Club of New York City. Playing in his best form throughout the 15 sessions of the round robin, Hanauer won 11 games, drew 3 and lost only once, to Carl Pilnick.

Second place fell to Jack W. Collins, former United States correspondence champion, who, after an indifferent start, applied himself in earnest in the later rounds and finished with a score of 11-4, just ahead of third prize winner Carl Pilnick, $101 / 2-41 / 2$. Bernard Hill, one-time titleholder of the New York Academy of Chess and Checkers, was a strong threat from the first and for most of the way followed close on the new champion's heels. Scoring 10-5, he spoiled his chances for a higher place than fourth when he dropped his last two games to J. Richman and Dr. Ariel Mengarini, former national amateur champion. A. E. Santasiere, former United States open champion and frequent holder of the Marshall title, took fifth prize with $91 / 2-51 / 2$, and Eliot Hearst, New York State champion and captain of the Columbia University team, recent winners of intercollegiate top honors, wound up in sixth position with 9-6.

Owing to the presure of his school studies, Larry Evans, club kingpin for the past three years, was unable to defend his title.

The new Junior Champion of the Marshall Chess Club is Karl Burger of Col-

| MARSHALL CHESS CLUB CHAMPIONSHIP, 1950-51 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Totals |
|  | M. Hanauer |  | 1 | 0 | 1. | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | $12 \frac{1}{2}-2 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 2 | J. Collins . | $\frac{1}{2}$ | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 11-4 |
| 3 | C. Pilnick | 1 | 1 | - | 0 | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | $101-4 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 4 | B. Hill .. | 0 | 1 | 1 | - | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 10-5 |
|  | A. E. Santasiere | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 91-51 |
| 6 | E. Hearst . . . . . | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 1 | - | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 9-6 |
| 7 | W. Goldwater | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8-7 |
| 8 | J. Sherwin ..... . . . | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 72. 72 |
|  | T. A. Dunst | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7-8 |
|  | J. Richman | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $6 \frac{1}{2} \cdot 8 \frac{1}{2}$ |
|  | H, Fajans | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | $5{ }_{2}^{2}-9 \frac{1}{2}$ |
|  | A. Mengarini ...... | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | $5 \frac{1}{2}-9 \frac{1}{2}$ |
|  | J. Donovan . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 1 | 5-10 |
|  | J. Foster. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | - | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 5-10 |
|  | Mrs. G. Gresser | 0 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 5-10 |
|  | R. Cohen ...... | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 2 | $2 \frac{1}{2}-12 \frac{1}{2}$ |

## TWO IDEAL BOOKS BY CHERNEV AND REINFELD



THE FIRESIDE BOOK OF CHESS by Irving Chernev and Fred Reinfeld. This handsome 400 page book features stories, articles and cartoons; 180 brightly annotated games; 50 brilliant combinations; 47 end-game compositions; 31 problems; a quiz; 121 "curious chess facts"; some 350 diagrams. $\$ 3.50$


WINNING CHESS by Irving Chernev and Fred Reinfeld. The secret of winning chess lies in proper use of combinative play-and here is a book which tells you how to recognize the distinctive, basic pattern for every type of combination. You learn when, where and how to combine on the chessboard. Getting to the very bedrock of winning chess, the authors illustrate their discussion with simple, decisive positions from actual play. More than 600 diagrams make it easy for you to follow the explanations without using a board and men. The result is a chess book which is easy to read, easy to understand, and one which actually improves your game. 213 pages. $\$ 2.75$

Send for complete catalog of books.

MAIL YOUR ORDER TO
CHESS REVIEW
250 West 57th Street, New York 18, N. Y.
umbia University whose score of $6-2$ shaded Philip Schwartz's $51 / 2-21 / 2$.
$W$ ashington. Back in the United States after an extended visit to Europe, Olaf Ulvestd celebrated his homecoming with a simultaneous exhibition against 28 players at the Seattle Chess Club. The master mowed down all his opposition except R . M. Vellias, who won, and Glenn Muller, who drew.
In Tacoma, a blindfold tournament was won by Schyler Ferris.

John N. Nourse took the Kitsap County title, followed by Jack L. Finnigan.


COMING EVENTS IN THE U. S.

## AND CANADA

Abbreviations-SS Tmt: Swiss System Tournament (in 1st round entries paired by lot or selection; in subsequent rounds players with similar scores paired). RR Tmt: Round Robin Tournament (each man plays every other man). KO Tmt: Knock-Out Tournament (losers or low scorers eliminated). \$\$: Cash prizes. EF: Entry fee. CC: Chess Club. CF: Chess Federation, CA: Chess Association. CL: Chess League.
April 7-8: North Carolina Open Tournament; at Selwyn Hotel, Charlotte, N. C. in 5 round SS Tmt (1st round, 9:00AM); open to all; EF $\$ 2$ plus NCCA membership ( $\$ 1$ ) ; trophy and $\$ \$$; write to A. H. Gaede, Box 1083, Charlotte, N. C.
Till July 31: Entries receivable for the 6th Annual (1951) Golden Knights Postal Chess Championship Tournament. EF $\$ 3$. Open to all in continental U. S. and Canada. $\$ 250$ first prize and $\$ 1,000$ total in 75 cash prizes. Complete details in advt. on page 93.

## WHERE TO PLAY CHESS

Classified advertising rate for this column 10 c per word. Display ads $\$ 7$ per inch.
 252 W. 76 th St. (EN 2-4455), N.Y.C. The only air-conditioned chess club in New York. Open daily from 2 P . M. to 1 A. M.

[^2]

Paul Keres
Sovjoto New Russian Champion by winning 18th title tourney

## (2)AAA

## Ontario

Winner of the major section of the Toronto Chess League was the Ukrainian Chess Club, 3-1. Hart House and Gambit tied for second, each $21 / 2 \cdot-1 \frac{1}{2}$, and the Estonians and Lithuanians brought up the rear with $1-3$ each.

## \& LATIN AMERICA

## Central America

The third Central American Team Tournament, held in San Salvador, was
won by Nicaragua with $221 / 2$ points. Costa Rica, 22, was a close second; third was taken by El Salvador, $171 / 2$; fourth went to Guatemala, $81 / 2$; and fifth and last to Panama, 5.

The showing of the teams' first-board players determined the individual Central American championship, which was annexed by Carlos Manuel Valverde of Costa Rica with the fine score of $71 / 2-1 / 2$. Runner-up was Joaquin Hurtado of Nicaragua, 5-3.
Costa Rica also starred at the second board in the person of Rogelio Sotela Montagne, 7-1.

## FOREIGN

## England

Dr. J. M. Aitken, 6-1, won the London championship from a field of 8 finalists who survived a knock-out tournament of 89 entries.
Outscoring a field of 71 rivals in the London Boys' championship, P. H. Clarke of St. Bonaventure's School won a Swiss tourney with a 9-1 tally.
Only six years old but already entered in a postal tourney, Richard Allen of Normanton is described by his father as being "keen as mustard." It will be interesting to follow this prodigy's development.

## Germany

Edith Keller, Germany's representative in last year's tournament in Moscow for the women's world championship, chalked up a real triumph when she took first in an event at Eisleben, East Germany, ahead of nine male contestants. Her winning $71 / 2$-point score topped that of her nearest rival by $11 / 2$ points-a considerable margin of superiority.


Sovjoro
Scene from the USSR Championship (XVIII). See story, page 39, February. Front Row: Smyslov (vs. Keres), Boleslavsky vs. Borissenko, and Flohr.


New York, 1857

THIS loss by Morphy to a tenth-rate player is an astonishing affair! FALKBEER COUNTER GAMBIT
J. W. Schulten

White
P. Morphy

| 1 | P-K4 | P-K4 | 5 | B-B4 | P-B3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | P-KB4 | P-Q4 | 6 | P-Q3 | B-QN5 |
| 3 | KP×P | P-K5 | 7 | PXKP | NxKP |
| 4 | N-QB3 | N-KB3 | 8 | B-Q2 |  |



If now $8 ., ., Q-R 5 \dagger$, White has 9 PN3, NxP 10 PxN, QxR 11 Q-K2 $\dagger$ with advantage.

| $8 \ldots$ | $B \times N$ | 10 | Q-R5 | R-K1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $9 \quad B \times B$ | $O-O$ | 11 | O-O-O | N $\times$ B |

A curious variation is $11 \ldots \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 7$ 12 N-R3! B-N5? 13 QxBPi!! KxQ 14 Px P§, K-N3 15 RxQ, RxR 16 PxP!

| 12 PxN | Q-R4 | 15 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | BxN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $13 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | P-KN3 | 16 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ | P-QN4 |
| 14 Q-R6 | B-N5 | 17 | P-B5 | PxB?? |
|  |  | 18 | P-B6 | Resigns |

## New York, 1915

TWHE isolation and entrapment of Black's Queen are neatly encompassed by White.

QUEEN'S GAMBIT ACCEPTED
J. Bernstein


New Orleans, about 1855
TVE are accustomed to seeing Morphy conquer brilliantly against great odds; but this time he comes a cropper. BISHOP'S GAMBIT
(Remove White's Queen Rook) (Advance White's Queen Rook Pawn to QR3)
P. Morphy

White

| 1 | P-K4 | P-K4 | 5 | B-Q5 | N-QB3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | P-KB4 | PxP | 6 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{KB3}$ | Q-R4 |
| 3 | B-B4 | Q-R5 $\dagger$ | 7 | P-Q4 | N-B3 |
| 4 | K-B1 | P-QN4 | 8 | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | B-R3! |
|  |  |  | 9 | Q-K2 |  |

## CHESS TACTICS

## The Power of the Double Check

PART of the potency of the Knight lies in its peculiar attack. On a check to the King, there are usually three defenses: moving the King, interposing one of its men; capturing the attacking man. On a Knight check, the King has one strike against it: no interposition is possible.

On a double check, however, there are two strikes against the King. Its only recourse is to run. For, in the single move at the player's disposal, he can make neither a double capture nor a double interposition. So, if the King cannot move, it is mated-even though, as in the following gamelet, both the pieces administering check may be en prise!

| White | Black | 3 | N-KB3 | P-Q4 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 1 P-K4 | P-K4 | $4 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | PxP |  |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB4}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $5 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{KN5}$ |  |
|  |  |  | $6 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\ldots$. |



THOUGH the next is also a gamelet, the combination in it is much more profound. The critical point, however, is the potent double check.

| White | Black |  | 5 | B-N3 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 1 | P-K4 | P-K4 | 6 | P-Q3 |
| 2 | N-QB3 | N-KB3 |  | 7 |
| N-B3 | O-O |  |  |  |
| 3 | B-B4 | N×P | 8 | N-KN5 | P-KR3 Of course, both $9 \ldots$ PxN 10 PxP and 9 . . P-KN3 $10 \mathrm{QxP} \dagger$ are fatal.



White can now win material enough by 10 NxP: e.g., 10 . . N-B3 11 NxQS. But he sees a chance for a prettier finish.
$\begin{array}{llll}10 & \text { N-Q5! } & \text { N-B3 } & 12 \\ \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{B} \ddagger!!!\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 1 \\ 11 & \text { Q-N6! } & \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Q} & 13 \\ \mathrm{NxP} \text { mate }\end{array}$
Moral: The double check is so rare a chance that, if you have one, it ought to assure you a winning combination.

# Ihre $M_{y l h}$ of of ter Bratlangy $P_{\text {rise }}$ 

 by Dr. S. G. JartakoererAsS every one knows or ought to know, the brilliancy prize in chess tournaments is awarded to everything and anything, except the true brilliancy. Consolation prizes, honorariums and a host of uncanny perquisites go under the guise of brilliancy prizes.

A case in point is the game, Schlechter-Salwe, St. Petersburg, 1909. Although the judges knew that the sacrificial combination initiated on the 22 nd move was really a bull, Schlechter was given the prize.


In the above position, $22 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{R1}$ would have maintained the positional bind. Schlechter wished to force the position, however, and played the double-edged 22 PxKP!?? Despairingly, Salwe accepted the exchange and the game continued $22 \ldots$ RxR? 23 PxN, PxP $24 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ and White's assault was irresistible.

Now, instead of the predatory grab of the exchange, Salwe could have refuted the entire plan by the simple expedient of 22 . . NxP. For example:
(a) $23 \mathrm{BxN}, \mathrm{RxR}$ and Black is the exchange to the good without any difficulties.
(b) 23 PxP, NxQ 24 PxQ, NxN† 25 Px $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{RxR}$ and Black wins.
(c) $23 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3, \mathrm{RxR} 24 \mathrm{QxN}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 325$ Q-KR4, PxP! $26 \mathrm{QxP}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 327 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 4$, KR-R1, and White's attack disappears into the thin air while Black's exchange plus tells.

In the above line (c), if $25 \mathrm{PxP}, \mathrm{RxP}$ 26 Q-KR4, K-N2 $27 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 5, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 428$ QR5, N-Q4 with the better game for Black.
Or, later in that line (c), if 27 BxP , NxB 28 QxNt, Q-N2 with the better game for Black.
$\dagger=$ check; $\ddagger=$ dbl, check; $\S=$ dis. ch.

TTHUS, it can be seen that under the test of simple, straightforward analysis, Schlechter was a dead cock in the pit. Yet, for this delightful but dubious effort, he was awarded the first brilliancy prize.

The "elegance" of Schlechter's conception and its subsequent finesses is one interpretation of the award. This argument, however, is just about on the same plane as that in the following anecdote:

In a coffee house in Zurich, two strong players are having a set to. A "butinsky" arrives and immediately remarks, "Here you missed an amazingly beautiful Queen sacrifice. If he moves his King, he is mate in two. If he interposes a Knight, he is mate in three. And, if he captures the Queen with the Knight, he is mate in four!"
"What happens, however, when my opponent takes the Queen with the Bishop?" asks the startled player.
"Oh that," replies the intruder, "doesn't concern me."
By the same token, the supreme court of brilliancy of St. Petersburg, 1909 was oblivious of what was involved. Semiofficially, it was admitted that Schlechter was given the first brilliancy prize as a consolation because he did not play well in the event!

$\pm$In the same vein is the story of the brilliancy prize awards of the Masters Tournament of Teplitz-Schonau, 1922. There the supreme judge of brilliancy was the late lamented Viktor Tietz. And there the mighty Akiba Rubinsteindespite one of his less mighty moments --fell heir to a windfall of no less than four out of seven brilliancy prizes. Mieses, Johner, Wolf and Tarrasch were the victims. Tietz rescued Rubinstein from ignominy by bailing him out with bril-
liancy prizes on the ground that any Rubinstein victory is a classic example of depth and logic.

The term "brilliancy" parades under fundamentally diverse conceptions. In the masters' tournament of Nurenberg, 1906, for example, prize judge, Amos Burn, awarded the top honor to the game Duras-H. Wolf. Not only did this partie lack the effulgent luster, but also the winner managed to snag a Pawn and the exchange.
"This game, after all, did not contain a sacrifice", complained a bystander.
"So what?" was Burns' placid reply.
1 Teplitz-Schonau, 1922, provided another amusing incident. There I received the third brilliancy prize for the Rook sacrifice in my game against Maroczy.

Tartakover


Black played 17 . . RxP! and, after many vicissitudes, won in 36 moves. Immediately afterwards, I submitted a precise analysis of all the variations to the prize committee, in which I not only demonstrated the soundness of the sacrifice but also its urgency. For, on the preparatory move of $17 \ldots$ N-B1, with the idea of . . N-N3, . . B-Q2 and . . . R-KB1, White consolidates with an equally good series of defensive moves, beginning with $18 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$.

The game did not rate a prize, despite this, thought one of the judges. "The sacrifice of the heavy piece could not have been made, foreseeing all the ramifications," said he.

According to this authority, the awarding of the brilliancy prize for hazardous play contradicts the very essence of a brilliant game.
Who knows? Possibly in the future, the American lie detector or some such similar apparatus will determine the true calculations of the chess master.
光
Amsterdam, 1950, provided an entirely original twist in the brilliancy prize award. In view of its many subtleties, as compared with rival entries, the game, Najdorf-Kramer,* ruled favorite, while Reshevsky-van den Berg and EuweKramer were also in the running.

The Prize Collegium of Prins, van Steenis and Cortlever, however, thought differently, and their vote went to Rossolimo for his effort against van Scheltinga. So much did this affect Najdorf, he

[^3]later admitted, that the savor of the fabulous banquet given at the conclusion of the tournament was lost.
The crisis in this brilliancy occurred after adjournment.*


## 41 R-Q6

The expected sealed move. It is clear that White's passed Pawn, together with two sweeping Bishops, outweigh the exchange.
41
Q-N2

All at once, the passed Pawn is triply attacked.

$$
42 \text { Q-Q2 }
$$

Thereby, White indirectly defends the Pawn with the Bishop at N8!


One can already anticipate ensuing developments.
If $42 \ldots \mathrm{R} / 1 \mathrm{xP} 43 \mathrm{RxR}, \operatorname{RxR} 44 \mathrm{Qx}$ R ! ! QxQ $45 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 5 \div$ !, Q-N2 46 BxQ 市, KxB $47 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 348 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 449 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3$, the duel of the Knight versus the Bishop offers fair chances.
Also worth considering is $42 \ldots \mathrm{~N}$ N8 43 Q-Q3, N-R6 44 B-K6, Q-R8 $\dagger 45$ $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 7$ and the fight continues. In this line, if $43 \ldots$ Q-R8, 44 Q-Q1, QB6 $45 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1$ !

## 43 K-B1?

Although this King move was praised highly in Amsterdam and apparently was the basis of the award, White actually let his advantage slip. Correct was 43 BQB7, PxP $44 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3$, with a difficult win for White.

| $43 \ldots \mathrm{PxP}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 44 P |  |

[^4]

Black lost heart. He should have played $44 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 5$. Then, after $45 \mathrm{PxN}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1 \dagger$ $46 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2$, RxP $\dagger 47 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ !! Q-R8 $\dagger 48 \mathrm{~K}-$ $\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 7 \dagger 49 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 3, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 8 \dagger 50 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{Q}-$ RS $\dagger$ with a perpetual check.

To boot, another acrobatic Knight maneuver also offered good chances. For example, 44 . . N-K7! 45 B-K6, N-Q5 $46 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 4, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 247 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{KN} 2, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 448 \mathrm{~B}-$ B7, R/1xP 49 RxR, RxR $50 \mathrm{BxR}, \mathrm{QxB} 51$ $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 5 \dagger, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 252 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 5, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{KB} 253 \mathrm{BxN}$, PxB and Black would have had somewhat better chances.

Note, in the above line, that, after 44 . . . N-K7, the Knight would have been immune. If $45 \mathrm{BxN}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 1$ and the mating threat at N8 would have decided.

| $45 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ | 47 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 5 \dagger$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $46 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ | $48 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Q} \dagger$ | $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{B}$ |  |
|  |  | $49 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 1$ | $\ldots$. |  |

Thus, after the melee, the position reached was similar to the one which might have obtained had Black played $42 \ldots \mathrm{R} / 1 \mathrm{xP}$. There was, however, this vital difference. White's King was now closer to the center and he had gained an important tempo. Under the circumstances, White's 43 rd turned out well.

| $49 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $52 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 6 \dagger$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| $50 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 7$ | $53 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} ?$ |
| $51 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 3!$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$ | $54 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 7$ |
|  |  | $55 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5$ | Resigns |

The unlucky Knight was trapped.

From the above, the reader can glean only an inkling of what was involved in awarding the brilliancy prize to Rossolimo. (Many substantiating and auxiliary variations have been omitted from Tartakover's original text because of space considerations.-Ed.)

The following episode sheds additional light on the final award.

In the eighth round at Amsterdam, in the game, Rossolimo-Gudmundsson, White was in great time trouble on his 38th move. Two seconds for three moves! So confused was the French master that he continued until his 42nd turn, and then-with the time threat out of the way-resigned. This was odd because he could have claimed a draw under the threefold repetition of move rules. He did not make such a claim. He did, however, charge that he was disturbed at the critical moment by his opponent, and the complaint was given no weight.

The ruling committee, however, realized that an injustice might have been done. When the opportunity arose-a
business firm offered a typewriter as a brilliancy prize-Rossolimo was mollified.

The chairman of the brilliancy prize committee, master Prins, awarded the prize to Rossolimo, as he explained, without any pang of conscience and with a philosophical quip: To us humans, truth consists usually in that which we would most like to be true.

To sum up, one can say that the victor in the game, Rossolimo-van Scheltinga, obtained the brilliancy prize because the loser failed to find the beautiful counterstroke, $44 \ldots \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 7$.

It is only poetic justice that Rossolimo should get the prize. In the past several years, he has contributed many original combinations to the chess world.


Dr 3 Davielly Grigorjevich Tartakover (French: Xavier), born February 9, 1887, on Rostov-am-Don in Russia of AustrianPolish parents, studied in Genf and then on the juridicial faculty of Vienna where he obtained the degree of Doctor of Jurisprudence in 1909.

He learned chess in 1897 (from his father), played in the international chessmasters' arena since 1905. He captured innumerable first prizes: Luttich 1930, Hastings 1945-6, Venice 1947, etc. He is a chess journalist and the author of many books on chess in different languages. A Breviary of Chess by him has been published in English.
In the International Team Tournament at Dubrovnik, 1950, he represented his adopted country, France, where he has resided since 1924. As Lieutenant Cartier, he served on the Free French Force during the last war, and he is now a naturalized French citizen. In earlier days, he represented Poland.

Since his health becomes more delicate with age, he toys with the idea of giving up practical chess and retiring to his villa in the Cote d'Azur. This plan is excellent-only for sundry reasons he has not yet acquired said villa.

# KERES' BEST GAMES OF CHESS* 

Ninth Match Game, 1940<br>QUEEN'S INDIAN DEFENSE

| Dr. M. Euwe |  |  |  | P. Keres |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White |  |  |  | Black |
| 1 P-Q4 | N-KB3 | 5 | B-N2 | B-K2 |
| 2 P-QB4 | P-K3 | 6 | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | O-0 |
| 3 N-KB3 | P-QN3 | 7 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | N-K5 |
| 4 P-KN3 | B-N2 | 8 | Q-B2 | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}$ |
|  |  | 9 | QxN | P-Q3 |

9 ... B-K5 has also been played here, although it seems to lack point because of the indicated reply, $10 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 1$.

10 Q-B2
P-KB4
Guarding against White's tactical threat of $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 5$ and his strategical threat of $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$.

## 11 N-K1

The logical continuation. He neutralizes the influence of the hostile Queen Bishop so as to be able to advance $P$ K4, which should bring to light weaknesses in Black's camp.

## 11... Q-B1!

An improvement on the customary 11 . . . BxB 12 NxB which gains time for White by assisting his Knight to a useful square and facilitating the communication of his Rooks. After the text, this is not so easy to achieve.

$$
12 \text { P-K4 N-Q2 }
$$

Relatively best, since, after $12 \ldots$. PxP $13 \mathrm{BxP}, \mathrm{BxB} 14 \mathrm{QxB}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{R} 315 \mathrm{P}-$ B4, Black's Knight is poorly placed, his King Pawn is backward and White's Queen has a commanding position.

## 13 P-Q5

Despite the promising appearance of this move and its strategical desirability (if $13 \ldots$ P-K4, 14 P-B4! with a fine game), its effect is nullified by the fact that Black has more pieces in play.

Better was $13 \mathrm{PxP}, \mathrm{PxP} 14 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 3, \mathrm{~B}-$ KB3 15 P-Q5 and Black will be confronted with serious difficulties in guarding his K3 adequately, especially since it is on an open file.

$$
13 \text {. . . . }
$$

BPxP!
But now this move is quite good, as Black's pieces soon become active.


14 QxP
$\dagger=$ check; $\ddagger=$ dbl. check; $\S=$ dis. ch,

If $14 \mathrm{BxP}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ and White's Queen Pawn is very weak, Or 14 PxP, N-B4 15 P-QN4, NxP 16 BxP ( $16 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{KR} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{KB} 3$, followed by . . Q-K1, leaves Black with a Pawn ahead and an excellent game), BxB 17 QxB, B-B3 and Black's position is quite satisfactory.

$$
14 \ldots
$$

N-B4

After Q-B2 (which would be answered in the same way), White's Queen would be more secure, but the pressure on the King Pawn would be slighter. The text, on the other hand, has the drawback of exposing the Queen to attack.

$$
15 \ldots \quad \text { B-KB3! }
$$

It is clear that, after $15 \ldots$ P-K4 16 P-QN4, White would have the initiative. Yet the text required considerable calculation, because the following pinning maneuver may be very troublesome.

## 16 B-R3

This has been criticized as being "too" logical; $16 \mathrm{PxP}, \mathrm{BxB} 17 \mathrm{NxB}, \mathrm{NxP} 18$ $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ is safer, but not inviting from the standpoint of striving for the initiative.

$$
\begin{array}{cc}
16 \ldots & \text { R-K1 } \\
\text { Actually threatening } & 17 \ldots \text { PxP! } \\
17 \text { B-K3 } & \ldots \text {. . }
\end{array}
$$

Parrying this last threat, and in turn menacing the win of the exchange by BxN , followed by $\mathrm{BxP} \dagger$.

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
17 \ldots & \text { Q-Q1! } \\
18 \mathrm{BxN} & \mathrm{PxP}
\end{array}
$$


$19 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 6 \dagger$ ?
White's consistency spells his downfall. Kmoch recommends $19 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ $20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2, \mathrm{BxB} 21 \mathrm{NxB}, \mathrm{PxB} 22 \mathrm{NxP}, \mathrm{B}-$ Q5 $23 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{BxN} 24 \mathrm{PxB}$ and White's Pawn weakness is not fatal. One must admit that such an alternative must appear distasteful in the heat of the battle.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
19 \ldots \mathrm{M} & \text { K-R1 } \\
20 \text { R-Q1 } & \cdots
\end{array}
$$

If $20 \mathrm{PxP}, \mathrm{BxQP}$ or $20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{QR} 3, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2$ 21 PxP, BxQP and Black wins in either event.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 20 \ldots \\
& 21
\end{aligned}
$$

## QPxB

Again, if 21 PxP, BxQP! $22 \mathrm{RxB}, \mathrm{Q}^{-}$ K2! wins. There is a mordant irony in the way that the pin has switched from White to Black.

P-Q5
. . .

Evidently intending to suprort the Bishop with P-B5, but this proves faulty. If, however, 22 Q-N4, Q-Q3 $23 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B5}, \mathrm{P}$ N3, followed by doubling Rooks on the King file, and Black wins in due course.

P-Q6!!
Beginning a magnificent combination which is evidently inspired by the wish to stir up complications as long as White's Bishop "hangs."


The foregoing sacrifice is justified, as will be seen, by the superb cooperation of Black's remaining pieces. Thus, if now $25 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1, \mathrm{RxB}$ and there is nothing that White can do about Black's contemplated . . QR-K1, followed by . . . R-K7. Or, if $25 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{RxB} 26 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1, \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{K} 1$ and wins.
25 R-B2
R×B
$26 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1$
QR-K1!

Played in the grand manner. Black's pieces are so much more effective than those of his opponent that he avoids exchanges.

## 27 P-B5

If at once $27 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 528 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 3$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 4$, followed by $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R} 6$, with a winning position.
27 ....
R-K4
28 P-B6
....

To prevent Black from later utilizing the King Bishop file. If instead $28 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 4$, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 7$ wins easily.
28 R-Q2
PxP
B-B1!

Threatening 30 . . . B-R6 31 R-Q1 (else . . . R-K8 mate), $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 44$, etc.

## $30 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 4$

Preventing the inroad of the Queen Bishop, but now the catastrophe arrives in another form.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 30 \ldots \text {. } \\
& \text { R-K6! } \\
& 31 \text { Q-N1 } \\
& \text {. . . . }
\end{aligned}
$$

$31 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$ is answered in the same way.
$31 . \ldots \quad$ R-B6 $\dagger \quad 33 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R} \quad \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 1 \dagger$

White resigns; for, if the King goes to the Knight file, . . . B-B4§ wins. If $35 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1 \dagger$ and Black mates with the Queen Bishop. What Bishops:

[^5]
## Fivew towin in the Cowing

## PHILIDOR'S DEFENSE

THE simple way is not always the best way. Ready ripost is its quest and goal, while long term considerations are discounted lightly.

So it is with the Philidor. In the delicate thrusts and parries revolving about center control, which engage the opening skirmish, Black employs an easy expedient. After the moves 1 P-K4, P-K4 2 N-KB3, he defends his King Pawn with the simple 2 . P-Q3. His plan is to hold the strong point at his K4 not by devious, tortuous maneuvers, but by straightforward defense. This is all well and good-so far as it goes. It does not, however, go far enough. For one thing, it frees White instantly to play P-Q4whereas the usual course compels the first player to resort to intricate stratagems and nearly exhaust himself before he can successfully enforce this move. In turn, this means that the pressure on Black's center mounts rapidly, and Black is reduced to a doubly defensive, cramped position. Black's second move, moreover, obstructs the development of his King Bishop. This fault is negligible since Black often posts his King Bishop on the second rank. By no stretch of the imagination, however, can it be considered a virtue.

Philidor's Defense was first noticed in the Gottingen Ms. (1490). It gains its name from the celebrated French player, Francois Andre Danican Philidor who remodelled and popularized it.*
by I. A. HOROWITZ


The typical position at the outset of Philidor's Defense

Today, it is occasionally adopted to steer the play away from routinized channels. Late world champion, Alekhine, sometimes gave it a flingusing the modernized Hanham Variation. In the main, its prospects may be summarized as expressed in the first line of a poem: "The Philidor is a horrible bore."

It does, however, win games!

The Philidor arises as follows:

| 1 | P-K4 |
| :--- | :--- |$\quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$

As a rule, when $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ is met by 1 . . P-K4, White's plan is to put mounting pressure on Black's King Pawn, until it is dislodged. When and if it gives way, White intends to usurp the center.

Black, on the other hand, places as many obstacles-tactical and strategical -in White's way as he can. With perfect defense, the struggle for the center is a standoff, and the players then direct their efforts to other fields.

Perfect defense for Black calls for counter threats sufficient to prevent White from successfully enforcing an

[^6]early P-Q4. For, when White's Queen Pawn engages Black's King Pawn, the pressure rises to such an extent that Black is soon compelled to swap. Then White remains with a dominating King Pawn as against a backward Queen Pawn for Black, and White virtually controls the center.
Black's efforts, therefore, are bent upon preventing an adverse $P-Q 4$. In the Philidor, this is not the case and, consequently, Black practically concedes the center. In turn, this means that his development will be retarded and backward.

In order not to confuse the issue, it should be noted that in many openings, such as the Scotch and Center Game, White can and does play an early P-Q4. The situation, however, is not analogous. For, in these openings, Black always gets some compensation for White's impetuosity. The compensation may be no more than a tempo. But it is compensation.

The text move permits, even provokes, the adverse $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ and gains nothing in return. On this account, it is deficient.
It is also deficient, to a lesser extent, in that it limits the mobility of the King Bishop.

## 3 P-Q4

The natural continuation. The idea is to force Black to play . . . PxP. In that case, White's King Pawn dominates a good portion of the center by commanding vital squares on the fifth rank, while its counterpart, Black's Queen Pawn, ineffectually touches only the fourth rank.

$$
3 \text {. . . }
$$

## $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$

Black must maintain his King Pawn at all cost. 3 . . . N-QB3 will not do; for, after $4 \mathrm{PxP}, \mathrm{PxP} 5 \mathrm{QxQ} \dot{\dagger}$, Black either loses a Pawn or forfeits the privilege of castling. The Knight on Q2, more-

[^7]over, allows for the construction of an interesting Pawn array, which is to serve as a barrier against invasion as well as a prop for a possible counter-attack later on.

## 4 B-QB4

The Bishop aims at the most vulnerable point in Black's camp-his KB2.


$$
4 \ldots \quad P-Q B 3
$$

The purpose of this move is threefold: To begin with, it clears the square, QB2, so that it may be occupied by Black's Queen, whence it must protect Black's King Pawn. Then the move indicates a future Queen-side demonstration based on . . . P-QN4-P-QR4 and a general expansion on the Queen's wing. Lastly, the move guards Black's Q4 so that no opposing man can penetrate with facility.

Note that 4 . . B-K2 loses a Pawn at once: e.g., 5 PxP, NxP 6 NxN, PxN 7 Q-R5, threatening simultaneously the King Pawn and the King Bishop Pawn. After 4 . . . B-K2 $5 \mathrm{PxP}, \mathrm{PxP}$, then 6 Q-Q5 wins.

The maneuver . . . P-QB3 and . . . Q-B2 is part and parcel of a system worked out and introduced into tournament practice by Major Hanham. The variation under discussion is therefore referred to as the Hanham Variation.


The text move is a good way to continue development, although alternative moves, such as $5 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ are also tenable. An interesting idea here is 5 PxP , PxP $6 \mathrm{BxP} \dagger, \mathrm{KxB} 7 \mathrm{NxP} \uparrow$. White gets a powerful attack, but it can be rebuffed by proper defense.

Another try is $5 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5$. Then the line might run as follows: 5 . . . N-R3 6 $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 3!7 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 28 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ and Black is able to hold the position with precision defense.

One missstep in the above line can be fatal. For example, if $5 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 36$ O-O, B-K2? 7 N-K6! PxN 8 BxN, N-N3

9 BxNP and White wins because of the uncomfortable position of the Black Monarch. In this line, $8 \ldots$ PxB 9 Q$\mathrm{R} 5 \dagger$ and White soon mates.

Finally, Alekhine recommended P-QR4, after . . . P-QB3 (as in his game against Marco) to prevent . . . P-QN4 once and for all.
5....

B-K2
Here again, Black can falter: 5 ... KN-B3? 6 PxP, KNxP 7 PxP, QN-B3 $8 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ and Black is in trouble. There are even pitfalls within the pitfalls. For example, if $5 \ldots \mathrm{KN}-\mathrm{B} 36 \mathrm{PxP}, \mathrm{QNxP}$ 7 NxN, PxN 8 BxP $\dagger$ and Black is out a Pawn. Or 5 . . . KN-B3 6 PxP, PxP 7 N-N5 and Black cannot hold the King Bishop Pawn.


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

It is quite possible that there is even a stronger line at White's command. 6 PxP, PxP 7 N-N5! BxN 8 Q-R5, P-KN3 $9 \mathrm{QxB}, \mathrm{QxQ} 10 \mathrm{BxQ}$ and White has the advantage of the two Bishops.
The text move, however, maintains the character of the game, insofar as it does not drive for an immediate endgame, even though a favorable one.

$$
6 \ldots
$$

## KN-B3

At last, after avoiding the traps and stratagems, Black is able to bring out all his King-side men.

## 7 P-QR4

This move is unusual, but pointed. Eventually, White contemplates action on the other wing. For the moment, he, therefore, stifles any counter play on the Queen-side. This ${ }_{4}$ would be possible if Black gets in . . P P-QN4-5. For the Pawn advance would dispossess White's Queen Knight and leave White's King Pawn unguarded.


$$
7 \ldots \quad \text { P-KR3 }
$$

Usual here is 7 . . O-O. Then White gets the better game by perfectly routine moves. The following is an example from the game, Alekhine-Marco, Stockholm, 1912: 7. . O-O 8 Q-K2, P-

KR3 9 B-N3, Q-B2 10 P-R3, K-R2 11 B-K3, P-KN3 12 QR-Q1, K-N2 13 NKR2, N-KN1 14 P-B4.

Observe the Hanhara idea in this line-Black's Queen at QB2 to maintain the center.

The text move conceals its real purpose. It is not to prevent the adverse $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 5$, as it appears at first sight. Instead, it is intended as a prelude to a King-side assault, with the Rook Pawn serving as a prop for the later advance . . . P-KN4. This plan, in conjunction with the maneuver . . . N-B1-N3 has the makings of a formidable assault in view. 8 P-QN3!
The idea here is to fianchetto the Queen Bishop, which then exerts indirect pressure on Black's King Pawn.

Against normal developing moves, Black is able to obtain equal chances. A game, Alexander-Fine, continued as follows: 8 B-R2, P-KN4 9 PxP, PxP 10 Q-K2, B-Q3 11 R-Q1, Q-K2 12 B-K3, N-B4 14 N-Q2, N-K3. Black's prospects are good.

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

Indirectly protecting the King Pawn, which will be under attack in the immediate future. On general principles, when a Queen is relegated to defend a Pawn, something is chronically wrong!

9 B-N2


Nimzovich-Marco, Gothenberg, 1920, continued as follows: 9 . . . N-B1 10 PxP, PxP 11 NxP, QxN $12 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 5, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ 13 B-R3, PxN (13 . . . P-B4 14 P-K5!) 14 BxQ -in favor of white.

9 . . . N-B1, however, is a blunder. Better is $9 \ldots$ O-O. Even then White's position is superior.

## Conclusions and recommendations

The one variation of the Philidor which has enjoyed even slight favor in tournament practice is the Hanham. Practically, it is self-condemned, per se, since it relegates a Queen to the menial task of guarding a Pawn, which may be attacked.

Despite the numerous pitfalls and dour prospects which exist for the defender, the Philidor is worth an occasional fling against a player who is oblivious of its proper course. The execution of Black's plan, unmolested, leaves him, strangely enough, with the upper hand.

In the CHESS MOVIES (next page), the defense gets a break. Black achieves certain objectives and demonstrates how coun-ter-attack is the best defense.


## A FLAILING PHILIDOR

GIMULTANEOUS attack and defense is the order of the fol-
lowing sparkling classic. Both Kings are exposed to flailing blows from all directions. Finally, Hungarian master, Breyer, sets up a series of irresistible checks and the immovable White King of Havasi is moved to resignation. Budapest, 1917, is the scene of play. The game begins with 1 P $\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 42 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 33 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 24 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{QB} 4, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 3$.


3White is first to enter with 11 N-B5. Black parries with $11 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$. White retreats $12 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$, and Black swaps 12 . . BxN. White recaptures 13 PxB , and Black now enters 13 . . N -B5. The opposing maneuvers are along the same line, except Black knows where the White King lives!


7 White attempts to consolidate with 23 RPxP . His attack can wait for a move. But it can't. Black replies 23 . . . BxP, and White's King position is deftly penetrated. 24 RxP is White's move, and 24 . . Bx $\mathrm{P}^{\dagger}$ is Black's bombastic reply. Checks must be respected and so Black has the lead.


4 There follows 14 BxN , $\mathrm{KPxB} 15 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kl}, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$. Black's abode is on the other side. White now readies for an onslaught against the Black King and prepares with 16 P-QB3. Black brings out the rest of his forces with 16 . $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$. This is the proverbial calm before the storm.


8White captures 25 KxB , and Black closes in with 25 . . . Q-R7t. White attempts to exit with $26 \mathrm{~K}^{-}$ K3, and Black keeps the King in place with 26 . . Q-R3†. Black dare not let up. If he fails to give check, he will be on the receiving end. And not for long. For White's checks are deadly.


1
There follows $5 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$, B-K2 6 N-B3, Q-B2 7 $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 3$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3$. White is making usual, routine moves, and Black is contemplating an assault against the opposing Monarch. His intentions, however, are well concealed. For who would suspect the puny . . . P-R3 as packing a wallop?


5$17 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 4$ is White's way of instituting the attack. The race is on. Black plays 17 . . . P-N5. There follows $18 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 1, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 319$ Q-R4, P-B6. Each side is poised for action against the enemy King. The same old question obtains: "Who will get there first with the most?" Only time will tell.


9
White retreats with 27 $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 2$, and Black captures 27 . . . QxNi . Always with check. White plays 28 $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 2$. Perhaps this will compel a respite. But no. Black pitches everything at his command into the fray. 28 . . . N-K5 $\dagger$ is the move. There is no let up for Black can't afford one.


2
White prepares the advance of his King Bishop Pawn by $8 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$, and Black signals the attack with 8 . . . P-KN4. Immediately, White swings his other Knight to the King-side with 9 N-K2, and Black follows suit. 9 . . . N-Bl is his move. Now follows $10 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KN} 3, \mathrm{~N}^{-}$ N3. All is yet serene.


6 White builds a barrier with $20 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3$, which Black immediately sets out to breach with 20 . . PKR4. White counters with 21 P-N5, and it appears that he has arrived. Black plays 21 . . . P-R5. It all seems so slow. Now comes 22 PxBP, PxNP. With one fell move, all fury is loosed!


10
29 BxN is forced, and Black answers with 29 QxR $\dagger$. The material gain is only incidental. The King is the target. White plays $30 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 3$, and Black continues with 30 . . . Q-R7t. More checks. It is impossible to avoid the checks. In fact, it is impossible to avoid mate. White resigns.

## The Brilliant Touch

A PREVIEW AND A QUIZ

For the quiz, cover the text below the diagrams befor you read further on this page. Then uncover to White or Black (below each diagram) which indicates the side to move and win. Now solve! At 15 minutes per solution. 8 correct solutions rate as master-play; 6 as expert; and 4 as very good, indeed.

IN compiling this collection of 240 scintillating brilliancies, W. Korn, the noted editor of the latest version of Modern Chess Openings, has produced a book which will gladden the hearts of all lovers of beautiful chess.
J. du Mont, one of England's leading chess journalists, has written an appreciative foreword which we quote:
"The popularity of books on combinations among chessplayers has a deeper reason than mere love of the brilliant, the sensational, the unexpected. No doubt this love is an integral part of their attraction, but deeper down there is the realization that the combination is an essential part of the game.
"When both sides have played tenaciously and well, there comes a time when the players are, as it were, on the verge of a deadlock, with a draw as the inevitable result.
"Then the supreme effort, the combination, comes to the


White
White's first and second moves are freely interchangeable, but Keres sensed that starting with the sacrifice of the heavy piece is more artistic than the reverse.

| $1 \mathrm{QxN} \dagger!!$ | PxQ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $2 \mathrm{NxP} \dagger$ | RxN |
| $3 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 8$ mate |  |



White
Here we see the "Plachutta," which means interference between Black pieces of the same motion.

1 R-Q5!! Resigns


Black
Black, a piece down, unpins his Queen by pinning White's and wins by:

| $1 \ldots$ | $R x P!!$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| 2 QxR | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4 \dagger$ |
| $3 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 3$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 4 \dagger$ |
| $4 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 8^{\dagger}$ |
| $5 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 2$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 8$ mate |



WHITE
The decoy decides the game:

1 Q-Kli!! ....
For, after 1 . . . RxQ, 2 PN3 mate.


White
Exceptionally subtle play:
1 R-B8
RxR
If $1 \ldots \mathrm{QxQP}, 2$ Q-B8 ${ }^{\dagger}$ !
2 Q-K7!! Resigns
If $2 \ldots \mathrm{QxQ}, 3 \operatorname{PxR}(\mathrm{Q}) \dagger$ and mate next move. Or 2 . . . P-R3 3 QxQ.

White

| 1 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 8^{\dagger}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 2 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 8^{\dagger}$ ! | NxB |
| 3 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 5$ | any |
| 4 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 8$ mate |  |




White
1 N-B6!
Called an "annihilation" key, coupled with line clearance.

| $1 . \operatorname{NxN}$ |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| 2 Q-R $7 \uparrow!!$ | NxQ |
| $3 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 5 \ddagger$ | $\cdots$ |

And mate next move.


Black
Black remains a Rook up after
1.... Q-Q2!!

Simple and conclusive!
the Bishop Pawn and so maintain a Pawn at Q4 without a potentially weak Pawn on the Queen Bishop file.

Here, however, Black is better off with 10 . . P-Q3 (see previous note).
11 QR-B1
P-Q4
12 PxP
QxP

12 . . BPxP definitely yields White the Queen Bishop file. So Black must switch and strive for . . . P-QB4.

```
1 3 ~ P - Q R 3
B-B3
14 KR-Q1
                                N-Q2
```

Now Black threatens 15 . . . P-B4. 16 PxP fails against $16 \ldots$ QxR $\dagger$.

$15 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 5$
The text leads merely to simplification. Instead, 15 Q-K3! offers White a considerable advantage. It not only prevents $15 \ldots$ P-B4. It also pins down Black's Queen and Queen Bishop in a highly uncomfortable position. As for 15 . . . P-KN4, that is met perfectly by 16 B-K5 !

| $15 \ldots$ | BxB | 17 KxB | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4!$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $16 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $18 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 5$ | $\ldots$. |


| Not 18 | PxP because of $18 \ldots$ | QxR. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $18 \ldots$ | BxB | $20 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | KR-Q1 |  |
| 19 PxB | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 2 \dagger$ | 21 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 4!$ | $\ldots$ |

A fine defensive action. White enforces an exchange which provides maximum activity for his pieces and so renders harmless the slight advantage in Black's Pawn formation.

| 21 |  | KR-QB1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21 . . . RxR $22 \mathrm{RxR}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 1$ is met by 23 PxP, PxP 24 QxP ! |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 22 \text { Q-Q3 } \\ & 23 \mathrm{RxR} \dagger \end{aligned}$ | PxP | 24 | PxP | P-QR4 |
|  | QxR | 25 | Q-N5 | PxP |
|  |  |  | Drawn |  |

## CUBA, 1951

Club Capablanca-U. S. Visitors Veeps in Action

The following, hard-fought draw saved the day for the U. S. team as it established the ultimate result of $31 / 2-31 / 2$. The Cuban Minister of Education misses a win in the middle-game. After that reprieve, the President of the Manhattan Chess Club puts up a tenacious resistance, finally leaving the Caballero with only two Caballos.

The game has its faults but is therefore an easier text to study than is the refined idiom of a perfect game. The study of the latter-thrilling as it may be-is often about as fruitful to the imperfect player as is staring into Tiffany's windows to this annotator's wife.

PHILIDOR'S DEFENSE
PCO: page 135
Dr. A. Sanchez Arango
Al Bisno
Cuba
United States
White
Black
1 P-K4
P-K4
$2 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$
P-Q3

White treats the opening discretely. The common, more enterprising line is 3 P-Q4.

| $3 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4!$ | 5 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $4 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | $6 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 2$ |  |
| P | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$ |  |  |

Black has a slight edge with $6 \ldots$. N-B3, holding his grip on the center.

## 7 P-Q4!

This excellent move-playable now that White's King Pawn is no longer under pressure-turns the tables.

| 7 | $\cdots$ | QN-Q2 | 10 | O-O-O | P-N4 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 8 | B-B4 | P-B3 | 11 | P×P | P×P |
| 9 | Q-K2 | Q-B2 | 12 | B-K6 | P-KR3 |

The text move causes serious trouble. Better is 12 . . N-B4! to force the exchange of White's King Bishop and then to castle King-side, with only a bit the worse in the game.

## 13 QBxN <br> NxB

Or 13 . . BxB 14. N-KR4! BxN 15 Rx N!! BxR 16 Q-R5 $\ddagger$, K-Q1 17 R-Q1, with a winning advantage for White.

| 14 B-N3 | P-QR4 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 15 P-QR4 | P-N5 |
| 16 N-QR2 | $\ldots$. |

$16 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QN} 1$, with an eye to a later $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$, is preferable.

| $16 \ldots$ | $B-R 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| $17 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B4} 4$ | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| $18 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |

There is no satisfactory defense.


19 R-Q3
His Excellency overlooks the winning line, starting $19 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 6$ ! and threatening 20 RxN! QxF 21 Q-N6 $\div$, K-B1 22 NxKP, Q-K1 23 Q-K6! followed by $24 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 6 \dagger$. The only remedy to the threat is $19 \ldots$ N-B4, but that leaves Black with a Pawn down in a miserable endgame: 20 QxKP! QxQ 21 NxQ and, e.g., 21 . . NxKP? 22 KR-K1, NxP 23 R-Q2.
19....

$$
0-0-0
$$

Now the President can breathe again although his game still remains very difficult.

| 20 | $K R-Q 1$ | $K R-K 1$ | 24 | $R-Q 6$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 21 | P-QN3 | B-B3 | 25 | Q-Q3 |
| 22 | $R-B 3$ | $P \times P$ | 26 QxR | QxQ |
| 23 NxBP | $K-N 2$ | $27 R \times Q$ | $\ldots$. |  |

White has no attack anymore, but his advantage is still considerable owing to the relative inferiority of Black's immobile Bishop in the endgame.

| $27 \ldots$ | K-B2 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 28 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |

Black threatens to win a Pawn with 29 .. N-B4.
29 R-Q1
$\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 4$
$30 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$
. . . .
$30 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ is stronger. The text move permits satisfactory counterplay.

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
30 \ldots & \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 6 \dagger \\
31 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2
\end{array} \quad \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1
$$

Not best as it leads to the exchange of Rooks. Black has much better: 31 .. NxP! 32 R-KB1, B-R5 $33 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 4$.

## $32 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 4$

$32 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ is less clear because of 32 . . . N-N5 $\ddagger$ and 32 . . B-R5, threatening 33 . . . N-K8 N .

| 32 |  | NxP | 38 | K-K3 | B-K2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 33 | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ | K×R | 39 | N -R2 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 4$ |
| 34 | N×RP | K-B2 | 40 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B4}$ | N-N3 |
| 35 | P-QN4 | P-B6 | 41 | K-B2 | P-R4 |
| 36 | PxP | NxRP | 42 | K-N3 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B1}$ |
| 37 | K-Q3 | N-B5 $\dagger$ | 43 | P-N5 |  |

43 NxP loses to 43 . . B-Q3, etc.

| $43 \ldots$ | PxP | 45 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $44 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $46 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} \dagger \dagger$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |  |
|  |  | $47 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 6!$ | $\ldots$. |  |

White forces a passage for his King. after which all Black's Pawns become vulnerable.

|  | P-R5 $\dagger$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{R} 7$ |  | B-B6! |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $48 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 4$ | N-K3 |  | N-B6 |  |
| 50 NxP fails against $50 \ldots$ NxN 51 |  |  |  |  |
| KxN, P-R6 $52 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 6 \dagger, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 153 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{~B}-$ K8! as the Rook Pawn marches through. |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $50 \text { } \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 7$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 2 \\ & \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 2 \end{aligned}$ | 52 | P-N6 | N-R3 |
|  |  | 53 | $\mathrm{N} / 7 \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |

This part of the game constitutes a study for problemists. White has many lines which should lead to laborious wins. We have not space here to run any out, but one such is 54 KxP .

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
54 \ldots & \text { B-B3! } \\
55 \text { N-K3! }
\end{array}
$$

55 NxP leads to a draw after $55 \ldots$ BxN $56 \mathrm{KxB}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 657 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 6 \dagger, \mathrm{KxP} 58 \mathrm{~N}-$ B5, N-Q6!! $59 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 7$. Black wins a Knight, then holds White's Pawns.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
55 \underset{\mathrm{P}}{\mathrm{M} 5} & \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 3 \\
56 & \cdots
\end{array}
$$

The patient $56 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ is correct.


Black seizes the chance to eliminate all the opposing Pawns.

Not the best fighting chance. White can still strive for a win by $58 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 2$ ! although it is most unlikely that he can definitely preserve his last Pawn.

58
Drawn
N-Q5!
There is not even the faint, theoretical chance of winning by preserving the defender's last Pawn. After 59 NxP , NxP 60 NxN, P-R6 61 N-R2, that Pawn is too far advanced for the two Knights and King to set up a mate.

## GREAT BRITAIN

 Hastings, 1950-51
## Common Sense

Emanuel Lasker once wrote a book on "Common Sense in the Chess Openings." The following game is an apt illustration of that title. Theoreticians have always disagreed as to whether 3 N -QB3 or $3 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB}$ best meets Tchigorin's Defense. White plays neither but simply follows his own sound judgment and obtains an opening advantage with ease. It's a good performance for tournament winner, Unzicker. And it has value with regard to theory, too.

## QUEEN'S GAMBIT DECLINED <br> PCO: page 196, column 108

| W. Unzicker <br> West Germany | L. W. Barden <br> Great Britain |
| :--- | ---: |
| White | Black |
| 1 P-Q4 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q4}$ |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB4}$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ |

Tchigorin's Defense. It has always been suspect but never convincingly refuted.

$$
3 \mathrm{PxP}
$$

Here White leaves the theoretical lines. To drive Black's Queen so early in the opening is a natural continuation.
$3 \ldots \quad$ QxP
5 N-B3 B-QN5
4 N-KB3 P-K4 6 B-Q2 BxN

7 . . . P-K5 \& N-Q2! also leads to a good game for White. His Queen Pawn is immune: 8 . . . NxP? 9 Q-R4†, NQB3 10 BxP .

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
8 \mathrm{NxP} & \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3 \\
9 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3! & \ldots .
\end{array}
$$

White now threatens to obtain a definite superiority in the middle-game because of his two Bishops and his mobile Pawn majority on the King-side.

Black misses his best chance: $9 \ldots$. NxN to switch to the endgame. Then his majority on the Queen-side is about as good as White's on the King-side. Of course, White then either retains the advantage of the two Bishops (10 QxN or $10 \mathrm{BxN}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 411 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$ ) or obtains that of a better Pawn formation ( 10 Bx $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 411 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N}$ ) ; but neither advantage is decisive.

$$
\begin{array}{rrr}
10 & \text { P-K4 } & R-K 1 \\
11 & \text { B-K2 } & \text { Q-KN4 }
\end{array}
$$

Black seems to have reasonable counterplay. As Unzicker points out, $12 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$, R -Q1 gives Black too much: e.g., 13 K R1, NxN $14 \mathrm{BxN}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 415 \mathrm{BxN}, \mathrm{QxN}$.


14 Q-Q2!
White threatens to thwart Black's counterplay and obtain a winning, Kingside attack, with $150-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$. There is no good way of preventing it.

$$
14 \ldots
$$

NxP
14 . . . N-Q4 has to be met more carefully. After 15 PxN? B-R3! Black has a draw at least. White wins, however, as follows: $15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ ! (threatening 16 R-KN1), QxRP 16 PxN! B-R3 17 B-K3! (Unzicker).

$$
15 \mathrm{PxN} \quad \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5
$$

After $15 \ldots$ QxKP 16 O-O-O, Black cannot capture the Bishop because of the threat of mate.

$$
160-0-0!\quad B \times B
$$

Or $16 \ldots$ QxB 17 Q-N5, P-B3 18 BxP, P-N3 19 QR-K1, Q-B5 $\dagger 20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 3$ (the only move to parry the double threat of $21 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 6$ and 21 QxB$) 21 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 6$, Q-Q2 $22 \mathrm{RxNP} \mathrm{T}_{\dagger}$ and mate soon after.

| 17 | R-N1 | QxKP |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 18 | R×P $\dagger$ | K-B1 |
| 19 | R/1-N1 | $\ldots .$. |

White threatens (in addition to such killers as $20 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 5$ or $20 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 7$ ) mate in four, by $20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 4 \dagger$, etc.

$$
19 \ldots \quad \text { Q-B4 }
$$

Against 19 . . K-K2, Unzicker gives this neat line: $20 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 121 \mathrm{RxB}$ ! QxR $22 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 8 \dagger$ ! KxR $23 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 5 \dagger$ and mate in three.

$$
20 \text { R/7-N5 Resigns }
$$

For $21 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 4 \dagger$ follows.

## USITAD STATES

## EXHIBITION GAME

New York, 1951

## Without the Right Spirit

The following exhibition game, played at the Manhattan Chess Club, is reminiscent of the man who commanded ten modern and five ancient languages but resorted to utter gibberish when talking to his child. For Fine and Reshevsky, though famous for their capacity of playing masterful chess at incredible speed, broke down when they had to make forty moves in two hours each. They made about half the moves in all the time, reaching a completely even position, and the rest in no time.

In this latter stage, when their minds could hardly realize what their hands
were doing, both faltered. But Reshevsky was lucky. He erred with impunity. The players seemed to lack the right spirit for a major event-which is a pity, since every meeting between Fine and Reshevsky is a major event in U. S. chess.

## NIMZOINDIAN DEFENSE <br> PCO: page 254, column 65

R. Fine
S. Reshevsky

White
Black

| 1 | P-Q4 | N-KB3 | 5 | KN-K2 | P-Q4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | P-QB4 | P-K3 | 6 | P-QR3 | $\mathrm{BxN}+$ |
| 3 | N-QB3 | B-N5 | 7 | NxB | PXQP |
| 4 | P-K3 | P-B4 | 8 | QxP |  |

White avoids the isolation of his Queen Pawn (8 PxP, PxP 9 BxP) which, however, offers better prospects than the text move.

| $8 . \ldots$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | 10 BxP | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 4!$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $9 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4$ | $\mathrm{PxP}!$ | $11 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\cdots$ |

Because of the double threat of $11 \ldots$ NxB and 11 . . . N-Q6 $\dagger$, White can retain his King Bishop only at considerable loss of time: $11 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5 \dagger$, B-Q2 12 $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 2$. So the text move is better.

| 11 | NxB |
| :---: | :---: |
| $12 \mathrm{QxN} / 4$ | O-O |
| 13 P-K4 | Q-R4! |

Black needs a safe place for his Queen, preferably a square out of range of White's Bishop. None such is available in the central zone, but his KR4 will serve.

| 14 | P-QN4 | Q-R4 | 16 | QR-Q1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 15 | P-QR3 |  |  |  |
| 15 | B-Q2 | 17 | R-Q3 | $\ldots$. |

It is a little disturbing to see all three of White's heavy pieces on a diagonal which Black's Bishop can possibly occupy. But there is nothing wrong with that for the time being. White threatens $18 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 3$.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
17 . \ldots 4 \\
18 \text { P-B4 } & \text { P-K4! }
\end{array}
$$

Now that ridiculous time-pressure is on: hence this ill-considered move. Instead, there are several perfect moves: e.g., $18 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Q1}$ or $18 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 5$. (Of course not $18 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ which loses the exchange.)
Still the game remains definitely drawish even after the text move.


The only alternative is $19 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 2$, but that loses to $19 \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 320 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 5$, BxN 21 PxB, Q-K7! 22 QR-KB3, N-K5! for then Black wins by the threat of $23 \ldots$ $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7$.
19....
B-K3!

Or else White loses the exchange.

## 20 . . . .

NxP
21 R-K1
21 P-B5 loses to 21 . . BxN 22 QxB (22 RxB is even worse), Q-K7! 23 Qx KP, P-B3 24 Q-Q5 $\dagger, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 125 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{KR}-$ K 1 and $26 \ldots \mathrm{QxB}$ or $26 \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7$.

| 21 | P-B4 | 23 | Q-Q1 | QR-Q1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 22 BxP | Q-B2 | 24 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | B-N6 |
|  |  | 25 | Q-N1 |  |

The decisive oversight. Correct is 25 Q-B3. Black then obtains the better game by $25 \ldots$ B-B7 26 RxR, RxR, according to Reshevsky. The nature of that advantage, however, is highly problematic: e.g., $27 \mathrm{NxN}, \mathrm{BxN} 28 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ ! RQB1 29 Q-B3! or $27 \ldots$ PxN 28 Q-N4. 25 ... N-Q7!
Winning the exchange.

| 26 | $\mathbf{R \times R}$ | $N \times Q$ | 30 | B-B5 | Q-Q6! |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 27 | $\mathbf{R \times R} \dagger$ | KxR | 31 | P-R3 | B-B7 |
| 28 | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 6 \dagger$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 1$ | 32 | R-K8 $\dagger$ | K-B2 |
| 29 | NxN | Q-Q4! | 33 | R-K7 $\dagger$ | K-B3 |

So terrible was the time pressure that Reshevsky first played 33 . . . BxNoverlooking the check. Such an oversight can have disastrous consequencse if the piece touched has a legal move.

| 34 | R-K3 | Q-Q8 $\dagger$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 35 | K-R2 | B $\times N$ |
| 36 | B-K7 $\dagger$ | $\cdots$ |

White plays on, apparently hoping his opponent may disregard another check with more fatal consequences.

As for claiming a win on the timelimit, it was out of the question as both sides of course had ceased to keep score.

| 36 |  | K-B2 | 40 | P-KR4 | P-QN4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 37 | B-B5 | B-K5 | 41 | P-R5 | Q-QB7 |
| 38 | R-KN3 | Q-K7 | 42 | PxP $\dagger$ | PxP |
| 39 | B-Q4 | P-KN3 |  | Resigns |  |

## TEAM CHAMPIONSHIP

## U. S. Intercollegiates New York, 1950

## The Better Desperado

Emanuel Lasker used the term, desperado, for a piece which may immolate itself since it is doomed, anyway.

In the following, difficult game, the climax features startling desperadoes for both sides. Elliot Hearst the present New York State Champion, is outdone by his predecessor, Larry Evans. Both youngsters, however, deserve full credit for their display of imagination and skill. It may be added that Hearst humbly insisted on considering this his best game in the event.

## One on the Kibitzer

As J. H. Blackburne garnered his winnings after a game for stakes, a spectator -who had not exactly enlivened the game by his numerous and uninvited com-ments-threw in a parting shot.
"How can you enjoy playing so noble a game for filthy lucre?" he asked.
"It's not the filthy lucre to which I object," replied Blackburne. "It's the filthy looker-on!"

KING'S INDIAN DEFENSE

| E. Hearst |  |  | $\quad$L. Evans <br> C.C.N.Y. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Columbia |  |  |  |
| White |  |  |  |

8 P-Q5 leads to PCO: page 271, column 118 , listed as favoring White.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
8 \ldots-\mathrm{K} 3 & \text { P-B3 } \\
9 \text { P-KR }
\end{array}
$$

While it is generally advisable to maintain the tension in the center, for this position, closing the center with $9 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ may serve as well, if not better. The text move requires some care to protect the Queen Bishop Pawn. Still there is no actual danger involved for White. The question is as to whether $9 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3$ or 9 $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ better retains the initiative.

| 9 |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $10 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |
| $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | 12 KPxP | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |  |



13 B-R3
The text is one of three good lines. 13 NxP, QNxN 14 PxN, NxP $15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ is another. Black faces the problem of how to develop his Queen Bishop. Kottnauer had an interesting answer versus van Scheltinga at Amsterdam, 1950: 15 ... Q-R4 16 Q-K1, QxQ 17 KRxQ, N-N5!. $18 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ ! $19 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ ( 19 BxP ? QRN1 20 B--N2, N-Q6 21 B-QB3, KR-B1!), QR-N1 20 QR-Q1, KR-B1, and Black is out of trouble.

The third good line is 13 P-B5, N-K5 $14 \mathrm{~N} / 3-\mathrm{K} 2!$ ! There may follow:
(1) $14 \ldots \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 215 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6$, and White gets rid of his weak Pawn while Black has an isolated Queen Pawn: e.g., 15 . . PxP $16 \mathrm{NxP}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 317 \mathrm{~N} / 6-\mathrm{Q} 4, \mathrm{QB}-\mathrm{R} 3$ 18 B-K3;
(2) $14 \ldots$ NxQBP $15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3, \mathrm{~N} / 3-\mathrm{Q} 216$ R-B1! Q-R4 17 N-B2! and White has the better game.

| $13 \ldots$ | R-K1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 14 P-B5 | N-K5 |
| 15 Q-Q3 | $\ldots .$. |

The last move starts White's troubles. The proper continuation, with a good game for White, is: $15 \mathrm{~N} / 3-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 216$ P-B6! (not 16 R-B1 because of 16 $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 1$ ).

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
15 \ldots & \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 2 \\
16 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 4 & \ldots
\end{array}
$$

A rather clumsy decentralization, but it is practically forced. $16 \mathrm{NxP}, \mathrm{N} / 2 \mathrm{xP}$ gives Black the better game.

| $16 \ldots$ | N-K4 | $18 \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $17 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2!$ | $19 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 2$ | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N}$ |
|  |  | 20 BXN | $\ldots$. |

White strives to save the Queen Bishop Pawn which falls after $20 \mathrm{PxB}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 5$.


20
N-B5!!
A beautiful finesse of the desperado type, by which Black obtains a decisive advantage. The main point is that he can now continue with . . . RxB, attacking the Knight. White can take neither the Knight nor the Bishop, and it seems he must lose a piece as both his Bishops are en prise.

21 N-N5!!
A beautiful desperado-reply. White finds the very best move. He has a good, fighting chance after 21 . . . RxB 22 PxB, P-QR3 23 RxP! PxN 24 QxR , NxB 25 KR-Q1. Unfortunately, however, he is lost even after the text move.

| $21 \ldots$ | BXN! |
| :--- | ---: |
| 22 P×N | BxP |
| 23 B-Q3 | P-QN4! |

Black's last clears the situation, and he remains with at least a strong, extra Pawn in a good position.

## 24 Q-N1

White misses the only slight chance for counter-play: $24 \mathrm{BxB}, \mathrm{QPxB} 25 \mathrm{R}$ Q6 (according to Hearst).

| $24 \ldots$ B-N | Q-R3! |
| :--- | ---: |
| 26 Q-R1 | BxP |
| 26 | $\ldots$. |

26 BxQNP loses a piece on account of $26 \ldots$ QxB $27 \mathrm{QxB}, \mathrm{QxB}$.

| $26 \ldots \mathrm{Q}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| 27 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 5$ |
| 28 BXB | $\mathrm{NP} \mathrm{\times B!}$ |

Another fine move. Black avoids the technical difficulty which he would have after 28 . . QPxB $29 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 6$.

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
29 \text { RxP } & \text { P-B6! } \\
30 \text { Q-B1 } & \text { Q-B5 }
\end{array}
$$

The rest is easy.


## MANHATTAN CHESS CLUB <br> Championship, 1951 <br> A Promising Deviation

The following game may open a new chapter on the King's Indian Defense because of White's new system of attack. Black overlooks a tactical consideration and loses quickly. It is difficult, however, to find a really satisfactory line for Black-even by hindsight.

Jack Soudakoff tried the new system about a year ago vs. Max Pavey, but that game ended in a draw and passed without much notice.

## KING'S INDIAN DEFENSE

G. Kramer

White
R. Willman
$\begin{array}{llllr}1 & \text { P-Q4 } & \text { N-KB3 } & 4 & \text { P-K4 } \\ 2 & \text { P-QB4 } & \text { P-KN3 } \\ & 5 & \text { KN-K2 } & \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}\end{array}$ $3 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 3 \quad \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2 \quad 6 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3 \quad \ldots$.
This is the new idea. $6 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KN} 3$ leads to PCO: pages 271-2, columns 116-121.

## 6... QN-Q2

Black pays no attention to the deviation and soon meets disaster.

Much better possibilities are offered by $6 \ldots$ P-K4 7 P-Q5, N-K1 and perhaps 8 P-KR4, P-KB4 or 8 B-Q3, Q-R5.

At this point however, it was very difficult to see that the usual way of treating this opening is deficient.

| 7 | B-K2 | P-K4 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 8 | P-Q5 | P-QR4 |
| 9 | P-KR4! | P-KR4 |

The disadvantages of allowing $10 \mathrm{P}-$ R5 are evident. Still Black ought to try 9 . . . N-K1 10 P-R5, N-B4. The text move has a far more serious drawback. $10 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5$ !
White has an idea, as will be seen, to which there is no satisfactory defense. For one thing, Black cannot break the dreadful pin. 10 . . Q-K1 fails because of $11 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5$.

10
$\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 4$


11 BxP !
The sacrifice suddenly reveals the main idea of White's system. It leads to a winning attack as the pin on the Black Knight becomes unbearable.

$11 \underset{\mathrm{NXP}}{ } \quad$| PxB |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| K-R2 |

On $12 \ldots$ QN-Q2, 13 Q-B3 threatens $14 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 3$ and $15 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 3$.

| 13 | Q-B3 | K-N3 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 14 NxB! | K×N |  |
| 15 | P-R5! | R-R1 |

Or $15 \ldots$ QN-Q2 16 P-R6 $\dagger$, K-R1 17 P-R7! followed by 18 R-R6.


On $23 \ldots$. B-N3 24 Q-B6! and White wins a Rook, by threat of $25 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 1 \dagger$.


## TITAN UNDER TRIAL!

SEE if you can defeat the all-conquering Alekhine in probably his shortest loss in serious play. The scene is Margate, 1937. The opening the Ruy Lopez, with the modern version of the Duras Variation. You can enjoy the fun by playing White with Paul Keres, the present USSR champion, as your partner. The opening moves are: 1 P-K4, P-K4 2 N-KB3, N-QB3 3 B-N5, P-QR3 4 B-R4, P-Q3 5 P-B4.

Cover the scoring table at the line indicated. Set up the position and make the fifth Black move, as indicated on the scoring table, then guess White's next move. Expose the next line and see what your partner actually played. Score par if you picked this move; if not, score zero. Make the proper move and opponent's reply, then select the next move. Continue this procedure to the end of the game.

COVER WHITE MOVES IN TABLE BELOW. EXPOSE ONE LINE AT A TIME.

| White Played | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Par } \\ \text { Score } \end{array}$ | Black <br> Played |  | Your Selection for White's move | Your Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 5. | B-Q2 |  |  |
| $6 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | - 5 | $6 \ldots$ | P-KN3 |  |  |
| 7 P-Q4 | 5 | 7 . . | B-N2 |  |  |
| 8 B-K3 | -5 | 8 . . | N-B3 (a) |  |  |
| $9 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | -6 | 9 . . | PxP |  |  |
| $10 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 5$ | -6 | $10 \ldots$ | N-KR4 |  |  |
| $11 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ | - 5 | 11... | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 5$ |  |  |
| 12 NxN | -5 | 12... | P×N |  |  |
| 13 P-K5! ? (b) | - 5 | 13. | P-KN4 |  |  |
| 14 Q-Q5 | -6 | $14 \ldots$ | B-KB1 |  |  |
| 15 BxB |  | $15 .$. | R×B |  |  |
| $16 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | -_6 | $16 .$. | Q-K2 |  |  |
| $17 \mathrm{BxN}(\mathrm{c})$ | -. 6 | $17 .$. | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ |  |  |
| 18 Q-Q3 | -. 5 | $18 .$. | B-Q2\% (d) |  |  |
| 19 NxP | -. 6 | 19... | O-O-O |  |  |
| $20 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | -. 5 | $20 \ldots$ | P-KB3 |  |  |
| 21 PxP | --6 | 21... | RxP |  |  |
| 22 KR-K1 | ---6 | $22 .$. | Q-N5 |  |  |
| $23 \mathrm{QxB} \dagger$ | -----6 | . . . | Resigns | ----------------- |  |
| Total Score | - 100 | Your p | centage |  |  |

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

Notes to the Game
(a) Alekhine errs! Correct is $8 \ldots \mathrm{PxP}$ $9 \mathrm{NxP}, \mathrm{KN}-\mathrm{K} 2$ or $8 \ldots \mathrm{KN}-\mathrm{K} 2-$ to be able to castle.
(b) Take five for this move, as played. Take a bonus 6 for $130-0$ ! Protracted analyses have proved $130-0$ gives White the better game, but $13 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5, \mathrm{NxP}$ gives Black a tenable position finally.
(c) Precise! On $17 \mathrm{NxP}, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ and Black has pulled out. He threatens 18 QxN or $18 \ldots$ NxP or $18 \ldots$ B-N5!
(d) Black must castle to hope to live.

* Position after 18 B-Q2.


Up-to-date opening analysis by an outstanding authority


## RUY LOPEZ

The Adam Variation, Part 5

T0 arrive at this important line of play, we begin with the following moves:

| 1 P-K4 | P-K4 | 5 | O-O | NxP |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 2 | N-KB3 | N-QB3 | 6 P-Q4 | P-QN4 |
| 3 B-N5 | P-QR3 | 7 B-N3 | P-Q4 |  |
| 4 B-R4 | N-B3 | 8 PxP | B-K3 |  |
|  |  |  | 9 Q-K2 | B-K2 |

In the October and November articles dealing with this variation, we consid. ered the reply, $9 \ldots$ N-R4.

In the January and February articles, the reply, 9 . . . B-K2, was discussed, and only the continuation, $10 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$, was studied.

In the present article, $9 \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ is still Black's move, but this time we try a different line for White: 10 P-B4! NPxP

THE BASIC POSITION


Now White has the choice of two continuations: 11 B-R4!? (complicated) and 11 BxP (simple).

Game 12
Played in 1947
(See the Basic Position)

## B. Sundberg

E. Book

White Black

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
11 \text { B-R4!? } & \text { B-Q2 } \\
12 \text { N-B3 } & \cdots .
\end{array}
$$

For 12 P-K6, see Game 14 (AitkenJ. Penrose).

$$
12 \text {. . . }
$$

$\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}$
For 12 . . N-B4, see Game 13 (Adam --Malmgren).

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 13 P \times N \\
& 14 P-K 6!
\end{aligned}
$$



Black has castled into "safety," but his position is difficult. If 14 . . . PxP? then $15 \mathrm{BxN}, \mathrm{BxB} 16 \mathrm{QxP} \dagger$ wins a piece for White.

$$
14 \ldots \quad N-Q 5!
$$

This move relieves his game somewhat.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
15 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{N} & \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B} \\
16 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 5 & \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}
\end{array}
$$

This line allows white to regain the gambit Pawn, but the position is difficult for Black. Thus, if 16 . . P-KB3, White wins the exchange by 17 Q-N4, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 318 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 6 \dagger$ (18 . . $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 2$ and 19 $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 7$ attacks the Queen and threatens $20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 6^{\dagger}$ as well).
But 16 . . R-K1 is a feasible alternative to the text.

| $17 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P} \dagger$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| $18 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{B} \dagger$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{N}$ |
| 19 QXQP | $\ldots$. |


19....

## R-Q1

Black develops with gain of time (if 20 QxP? B-N4).

## 20 Q-QR5

## B-B3

If now 21 QxRP, Q-K5 $22 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$, $\mathrm{Q}^{-}$ Q4, Black's material minus is out-
weighed by the superior placement of his pieces and the presence of Bishops of opposite color.


$$
\begin{array}{ll}
11 \text { B-R4!? } & \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 2 \\
12 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3 & \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B4}
\end{array}
$$

This reply is seemingly more solid than $12 \ldots$ NxN (Game 12), but White gets a very promising gambit attack just the same.

| 13 BxN | BxB |
| :--- | ---: |
| $14 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ |
| $15 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 5$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{KB1}$ |

An unpleasant retreat; but, if $15 \ldots$ P-N3 16 N-N7\%, K-B1 17 B-R6, K-N1, Black's King Rook is nailed down for good.

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
16 \text { R-Q1 } & \text { Q-B1 } \\
17 \text { Q-B3 } & P-Q B 3
\end{array}
$$

Black solidifies his Pawn position, even at the cost of burying his Queen Bishop for some time to come. The plausible 17 . . P-Q5 is answered by 18 N-Q5, P-Q6 $19 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{B} 5-\mathrm{K} 3$, as Black's Pawns have been weakened rather than strengthened.

$$
18 \text { P-QN3! }
$$

White offers a second Pawn to open new lines.

| $18 .$. | $P \times P$ | 21 | $N-N 6$ | $Q-Q 1$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 19 | $R-K 1$ | $N-K 3$ | 22 Q×NP | $B-B 4$ |
| 20 N-QR4 | QR-N1 | 23 N-QR4 | B-R1 |  |
|  |  | 24 Q-N3 | $Q-R 4$ |  |



## 25 N-B3

If Black tries to win a piece by 25 $P-Q 5$, White has a winning reply in

26 NxP†! NxN 27 QxN, R-KB1 28 B-N5,
PxN 29 P-K6! Or 26 . . . K-Q2 27 NxN , KxN 28 Q-N4 $4, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 229 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5 \dagger$ with a winning game.

| $25 \ldots \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 6 \dagger$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| 27 PxB | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N}$ |
| 27 | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |

Black is by no means out of the woods!


28
$\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 2$
If 28 . . . KR-Q1, White wins by 29 Q-K5 with the threats of $30 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 4$ ! or, if Black relieves the pin of his Queen Pawn, 30 Q-B6, followed by 31 RxN , etc.

If $28 \ldots$ KR-K1, White wins by 29 $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 7, \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Q} 130 \mathrm{RxN}, \mathrm{PxR} 31 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 5$.

$$
\begin{array}{llr}
29 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N} & \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{B} \\
30 & \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 7 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q5}
\end{array}
$$

Black's Bishop is about to come to life.

| 31 | N-K4 | Q-Q4 | 34 | R-K7 | Q-Q4 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 32 | P-KR3 | P-QB4 | 35 | R-K5 | Q-B3 |
| 33 | R-K5 | Q-B3 |  | Drawn |  |

Adam later claimed that he could have won with 36 Q-N5.

## Game 14 <br> liford, 1950 <br> (See the Basic Position)

J. M. Aitken
J. Penrose
White
11 B-R4!?
12 P-K6
Black
B-Q2

Interesting and flashy, and perhaps even stronger than $12 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$.

$13 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N}$
But this is not the best, as $13 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ can give Black plenty of trouble. Thus, if $13 \ldots \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 414 \mathrm{BxN}, \mathrm{BxB}, 15 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 5$ attacks the Bishop and threatens 16 QR5i. If $13 \ldots \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3,14 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KN} 5$ creates troublesome pressure. If $13 \ldots \mathrm{NxN}$,

14 PxN again threatens 15 BxN , followed by N-K5. Nor can Black play 14 . . O-O (after $13 \ldots$ NxN 14 PxN) because of 15 BxN , winning a piece.

```
13 ....
BxB
\(14 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 5\)
Q-Q3
```

Black's position looks ticklish, but he has ample resources. If, for example, 15 B-B4, Black has $15 \ldots$ Q-B4 16 B-K3? $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$, etc.

| 15 | Q-R5 $\dagger$ | $P-N 3$ | 18 | B-B4 | Q-B4 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 16 | N $\times N P$ | N-B3 | $19 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{N}$ |  |
| 17 | Q-R3 | KR-N1 | 20 BxP | $R-\mathrm{N} 3$ |  |

Of course not $20 \ldots$ QxB 21 QxP , recovering the piece with a winning attack. But Black merely consolidates, remaining with a won game because of his powerful center Pawns.

| 21 B-N3 | B-Q2 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 22 Q-R4? | N-K5 |
| 23 Q-R5 | Q-N4! |

Black forces the exchange of Queens to good effect. White cannot decline; for, if 24 QxP ? R-R3 wins ( $25 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR4}$, NxB!).

| 24 QxQ | R×Q | 26 | RPxN | QR-N1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $25 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | NxB | 27 | QR-N1 | K-K2 |
|  |  | 28 | KR-K1 | K-B3 |



29 P-B3
White gives up a Pawn to get the King into play. Not that this helps much-Black's Pawns are too strong.

| 29 |  | R×KNP | 44 | P-B4 | P-R5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 30 | K-B2 | QR-N1 | 45 | R-R7 | P-R6 |
| 31 | R-N1 | R/6-N2 | 46 | R-R8 | R-R8 |
| 32 | P-QN3 | R-QB1 | 47 | K-N4 | P-R7 |
| 33 | KR-QB1 | 1 PxP | 48 | R-R6 | K-K2 |
| 34 | $\mathbf{R \times P}$ | R-B3 | 49 | K-N5 | P-Q5 |
| 35 | R-N7 | B-K1 | 50 | R-R7 $\dagger$ | K-Q3 |
| 36 | R-N8 R/ | R/2-QB2 | 51 | R-R3 | K-B4 |
| 37 | RxB | RxN | 52 | K-B6 | K-N5 |
| 38 | R-B8 $\dagger$ | K-N2 | 53 | R-R8 | P-Q6 |
| 39 | RxR | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ | 54 | R-N8 $\dagger$ | K-B6 |
| 40 | R-K8 | R-B7 $\dagger$ | 55 | R-88 $\dagger$ | K-Q5 |
| 41 | K-N3 | K-B3 | 56 | R-QR8 | P-Q7 |
| 42 | R-KR8 | RxRP | 57 | R-Q8 $\dagger$ | K-K6 |
| 43 | $\mathbf{R \times P}$ | P-R4 |  | Resigns |  |

Despite White's defeat in this game, we must credit White with a strong opening position after $11 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 4$ !? and 12 P-K6.

Game 15
National Club Championship Great Britain, 1950
(See the Basic Position)
J. M. Aitken
O. Penrose
White
Black
11 BxP !

Simplest and best. Why bother with gambit sacrifices when the text leads to a lasting positional advantage?

$$
11 \ldots \quad P \times B
$$

Seriously weakening his Queen-side Pawn position, but $11 \ldots \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 4$ is answered by 12 R -Q1 leaving Black with a very uncomfortable position.

| 12 QxN | Q-Q4 | 15 | $R-Q 1$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13 | $Q-B 4$ | $O-O$ | 16 |
| $N-K 1$ | $Q-B 4$ |  |  |
| 14 N-B3 | Q-Q6 | $17 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ | B -B4 |

> Black's two Bishops are inadequate compensation for his permanently weak Pawn position.

| 18 Q×Q | B×Q |
| :--- | ---: |
| 19 | B-B4 |
| 20 | P-QN3! |



Black threatens $21 \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 7$, winning the exchange. If $20 \ldots$ PxP, instead, 21 PxP offers the terrible threat of bring. ing a Rook to the Queen Bishop file. No matter how Black plays, the best he can expect is to lose a Pawn as his Queen-side weaknesses are gobbled up.

| 21 | B-B1 | $B \times B$ | 24 | $R \times P$ | $K R-Q 1$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 22 | QR×B | $B-K 3$ | 25 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ |
| 23 | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | 26 | $\mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 1$ |

Black has lost a Pawn, as anticipated, and the rest is technique.

| 27 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | P-QR4 | 33 | PxP | B-Q4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 28 | P-B4 | N-N5 | 34 | P-QN4 | K-B1 |
| 29 | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N}$ | 35 | P-N5 | R-R8 $\dagger$ |
| 30 | P-KR3 | B-K3 | 36 | K-B2 | R-QN8 |
| 31 | N-Q3 | P-R5 | 37 | P-N6! | R-N7 $\dagger$ |
| 32 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 5$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | 38 | K-K3 | BxP |
|  |  |  | 39 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 7$ | Resigns |

The gambit 11 B-R4!? adopted by White in Games 12, 13 and 14 is tricky and creates considerable trouble for Black. The simpler 11 BxP gives White a strong positional plus without risk. To sum up, $10 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ ! may turn out to be White's best move and is certainly deserving of more extensive investigation and adoption.

## One on the Souse

During a simultaneous exhibition, the English master, Blackburne, came upon a glass of whiskey standing by an opponent's board. Blackburne, an inveterate whiskey-drinker, promptly drained the glass, made his move and went on.

Later, he explained how he happened to defeat that opponent so quickly: "He left a glass of whiskey en prise and I took it en passant. That little mistake ruined his game."

# THE AMSTERDAM TOURNAMENT 

Game Annotations by HANS KMOCH

## Supreme Effort

As Haje Kramer* scored only $51 / 2-131 / 2$, it seems natural that Najdorf defeated him. But there is a vast difference, one win from another. Here Najdorf's imagination and tactical mastery reach a supreme high. Seldom has so brilliant an attack been created so quickly-and from almost nothing.

It is a truism that one player cannot win unless the other makes mistakes. Yet here one can hardly perceive Black has made any until Najdorf proves it.

## CATALAN SYSTEM

M. Najdorf Argentina White

| 1 | P-Q4 | N-KB3 | 4 | B-N2 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2 | P-QB4 | P-K3 | 5 | N-KB3 |
| 3 | QN-Q2 |  |  |  |
| 3 | P-KN3 | P-Q4 | 6 | QN-Q2 |

With 6 Q-R4, White can transpose into the usual lines: PCO: page 316, column 23.

| $6 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | $9 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4 \dagger$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $7 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $10 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 3$ |
| $8 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | $\ldots$. |

Najdorf took a long time on this move which many players would have rejected since White gets an isolated Pawn on the Queen file.
11. 12 Q-B2
$\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 4$
$13 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$
P-Q6

White has hardly any adyantage but he has reached a position which will not easily become drawish. This is in itself a practical success for a fighter like Najdorf.

$$
14 \ldots \quad \text { B-K2 }
$$

Black misses his best move: 14 . . . $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 3$ ! (to render $15 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 5$ harmless). He need not fear 15 BxN .

## $15 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 5$ !

Now White's advantage is real, though small. Black has some difficulty in protecting his Queen Knight Pawn. It is uneconomical to do so with a Queen.

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
15 \ldots & O-O \\
16 \text { QR-B1 } & \text { KR-Q1 }
\end{array}
$$

Another second rate move. Black ought instead to protect his Queen Knight Pawn with $16 \ldots$ B-R3 and, subsequently, maintain the possibility of . . Q-Q1. His Queen stands more safely and has better prospects at its Q1.
17 KR-K1
18 Q-K2
N -Q4
B-KB3

With 18 . . . B-K1! Black avoids the weakening of his King position which now becomes necessary.

[^8]
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$$
\begin{array}{ll}
19 \text { Q-R5! } & \text { B-K1 } \\
20 \text { B-K4! } & \text { P-N3 }
\end{array}
$$

Black chooses the worst. 20 . . . PKR3 is a less serious weakening. 21 Q-K2
White now threatens to obtain a powerful attack on the King-side with 22 $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 4, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 523 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 4$. Black has a bad game whatever he plays.
$21 \ldots$
QR-B1
$22 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 4$
B-Q5

Black's last looks reasonably good, but it loses by force!


If $25 \ldots$ K-N2 26 Q-N4! Black must play 26 . . . BxB, losing the exchange. And $25 \ldots$ K-R1 26 Q-K7! forces $26 \ldots$ $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 2$ as in the game.

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
26 \text { Q-K7 } \dagger! & \text { K-N2 } \\
27 & \text { R-K6!! } & \cdots .
\end{array}
$$

The beautiful point to which there is no remedy:
(1) $27 \ldots \mathrm{QxR} 28 \mathrm{BxB}_{\dagger}^{\dagger}$ and mate soon follows;
(2) $27 \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 328 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 5 \dagger!$ PxN 29 Q-N5 $\dagger, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 130 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 6 \div$ and mate next;
(3) $27 \ldots \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 428 \mathrm{QxQ}$, RxQ 29 Bx $\mathrm{B} \dagger, \mathrm{KxN} 30 \mathrm{RxB}$, and White wins;
(4) $27 \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 8 \div 28 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 2!\mathrm{BxB} 29$ RxQ, PxR 30 QxB , and White wins more quickly than in the actual game.

27 ....
$\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$
The only way of prolonging the struggle. White emerges, however, with Queen against Rook and Bishop.

| 28 | RxQ | PxR | 33 | Q-Q4 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: | P-QN4

Actually, Black exceeded the time-limit, but that is irrelevant.

## A Classic Attack

The following battle is fought for the most part on little known territory. Hence Najdorf finds and indeed uses splendidly an opportunity to display his natural talent. The impetus of his attack is stunning; the result a classic victory.
His opponent, Tartakover, has been an expert in contesting strange openings himself. But this time he misses that shrewd alertness required. He lets slip a chance to castle and play for safety, in hunting instead to gain an advantage.

## SICILIAN DEFENSE

PCO: page 432, column 66 (b)

| Dr. S. Tartakover |  |  | M. Najdorf |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Argentina |  |  |  |

This gambit is the only good continu-ation-provided that it is good. It has little background to prove it in master play. If it is good, then 7 N -B5 is bad, and White must play $7 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3$, which retains an advantage according to Fine. If it is not, then $6 \ldots \mathrm{QN}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ has to be replaced by $6 \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$, which is satisfactory, again according to Fine.

```
8 PxP
9 BxN }
P-QR3
```

Or else Black recovers the Pawn: 9 $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3$ or $9 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 4, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 4$.

$11 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 412 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ leads to an even game (or rather a game with even chances). But White wants more.

```
11... B-B4
1 2 ~ P - Q R 4
....
```

Not 12 P-QB4, B-Q5!

| $12 \ldots \ldots$ | R-QN1 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 13 PxP | PxP |
| 14 Q-Q3 | $\ldots .$. |

[^9]14 P-QB4, PxP favors Black still: 15 PxP, B-Q5 or 15 NxP, B-Q5 $16 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 2$, QxP. Also bad is $14 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 515 \mathrm{~B}-$ Q2, P-N5.

With the text move, White prepares for either $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ or $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$, but he incurs considerable risk of losing time.

A safer line which should just suffice for a draw is $14 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{NxP} 15 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 1$.

14 QN-K5!!
$15 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$
More consistent and better, despite all risks involved, is 15 P -QB4.

$$
15 \ldots N-R 4!
$$

The beginning of an attack which gathers momentum with terrific speed and soon becomes irresistible.

## $16 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3$

White misses his last chance to make a firm stand. Correct is $16 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 5$ 17 Q-Q2.

| $16 \ldots \mathrm{~B}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B4}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 17 B 2 | $\cdots$ |

17 O-O loses a piece to $17 \ldots$ P-B5.

| $17 \ldots$ N-K2 | N-B3 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 18 R-K1! |  |
| 19 P-QB4 | $\cdots \cdots$ |

At long last-but too late!
19 O-O loses because of $19 \ldots$ NxP after which Black threatens to win a piece with either $20 \ldots$ P-B5 or $20 \ldots$ NxN $21 \mathrm{BxN}, \mathrm{QxQ}$.

| 19 P. | P-K5! |
| :--- | ---: |
| 20 PXKP | P×BP |
| 21 NPxP | N×KP |

Black threatens 22 . . NxB, etc. $22 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 1$


$$
22 \ldots \quad \text { P-B5!! }
$$

The conclusive stroke which enables the Queen and the Queen Bishop to join the attack: e.g., $23 \mathrm{PxP}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 5$ or 23 Bx $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 624 \mathrm{BxR}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 5 \dagger$, etc.

| 23 | $R-K B 1$ | $P \times P$ | 27 | $N \times B$ | Q×P $\dagger$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 24 | $P \times P$ | $Q-R 6$ | 28 | $K-Q 1$ | $N \times N+$ |
| 25 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5 \dagger$ | 29 | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| 26 | $\mathrm{~N} / 1-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N} \dagger$ | Resigns |  |  |

## Psycho-Analysis?

The following game is notable more for its result than its course. Since Reshevsky defeated Gligorich at Dubrovnik, it was a great performance that he defeated him at Amsterdam, too. The game itself is not so glorious, for White obtains a great, positional advantage along rather well-known lines, slackens, then profits by an error which costs a piece.

Most interesting, however, is the story revealed by the moves of the Yugo-
slavian champion. We can see how wavering and indecision pyschologically pave the road to doom. Black tentatively starts upon an Indian defense but hesitates and, probably swayed by recollection of how he failed in such at Dubrovnik, turns the game into a Queen's Gambit. He seems then to repent and strives for a more lively game-but only with the effect of conceding White a clear edge. At last, pressed for time, he overlooks an undeserved chance, falters instead, and his game falls apart.

## QUEEN'S GAMBIT DECLINED


S. Gligorich Yugoslavia
U. S. A.

White Black

| 1 P-Q4 | N-KB3 | 5 P-K3 | O-O |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 2 P-QB4 | P-K3 | 6 Q-B2 | QN-Q2 |  |
| 3 N-QB3 | P-Q4 | 7 PxP | P×P |  |
| 4 B-N5 | B-K2 | 8 B-Q3 | P-KR3 |  |
|  |  |  | 9 | B-R4 |
|  |  | P-QN3 |  |  |

The opening does not follow the books but has features of several common lines: e.g., PCO: pages 168, 179 and 185. Black's usual continuation would now be $9 \ldots$ P-B3, followed by $10 \ldots$ RK1. The text move is more enterprising but somewhat risky, too. For it requires . . . P-QB4 after which Black's Pawn formation becomes a bit shaky.

| 10 | N-B3 | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | 12 | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 11 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | 13 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 4$ |
| B | K 5 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |  |  |

Black's King Knight has no retreat after $13 \ldots$ NxB 14 PxB. Hence the text move which creates the possibilities: ... N-B4 or (after 14 PxP, NxB) . . . N-B5. The isolation of Black's Queen Pawn, however, becomes very inconvenient for him.

| 14 BXQP! | $\mathrm{N} / 5-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 15 KR-Q1 | B-Q3 |
| 16 N-QN5 | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B4}$ |

Black lost this tempo advisedly, it seems, his idea being to distract the White Queen Knight from the Queen Pawn.

| 17 | B-B5 | Q-K2 | 19 | Q-N3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 18 | QR-B1 | KR-Q1 | 20 | N-B3 |
|  |  |  | 21 | R×B |
|  |  | Q-Q3 |  |  |

Outplayed, Black strives for a desperate complication. He almost succeeds in getting out of trouble.

22 P-K4
Inaccurate. White has a clear, winning advantage if he first plays 22 BxN!: 22 . QxB 23 QxNP or $22 \ldots$ NxB 23 NxP , $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 424 \mathrm{QxP}$ or $22 \ldots$ RxB $23 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$.
22.... N-K4! 24 QxNP KR-N1
$23 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{N} \quad \mathrm{QxN} \quad 25$ QR-Q1 P-N3

Black's last move is a decisive error. Instead, 25 . . PxP! leads to an almost even game: e.g., $26 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} \dagger \dagger, \operatorname{RxR} 27 \mathrm{RxR} \dagger$, RxR 28 QxRi, N-K1 29 B-Q7, K-B1. White has some winning chances in the end-game after $30 \mathrm{QxN} \dagger$, etc.


26 P-B4!
The winning move. The end-game after $26 \ldots \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 227 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 128 \mathrm{QxN}$, $\mathrm{QxQ} 29 \mathrm{PxQ}, \mathrm{BxB} 30 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 3$ is untenable for Black.
26 . . .
27 QxN
QxBP
PxP

Of course, Black could recapture the piece, but his position is demolished, anyway.

The rest is of little interest. One usually does not resign a bad game, in severe time pressure. That's why Black con-tinues-until he loses a Rook, too.

| 28 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB} 1$ | Q-K6 $\dagger$ |  | 34 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 29 | $\mathrm{R} / 1-\mathrm{N} 5$ |  |  |  |  |
| 29 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 4$ | 35 | $\mathrm{R} / 1-\mathrm{Q} 1$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4$ |
| 30 | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Q}$ | $36 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 8$ |  |
| 31 | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{KP}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ | 37 | $\mathrm{R} / 1 \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} / 5$ |
| $32 \mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ | 38 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 7$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |  |
| 33 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$ | $\mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{N} 1$ | 39 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 8 \dagger!$ | Resigns |

## Bright Refutation

Everyone knows that to start a maneuver before having castled is dangerous. The experienced player knows, however, there are exceptions to that rule. Much depends on the status of the center: a closed center permits, an open one forbids such action.

On this point, Black falters in the following game. His attempt to secure the advantage of the two Bishops meets with disaster. For it is started when the center looks closed but actually is not-the Pawns there are fluid.

Even so, White wins only by virtue of masterly counterplay.

## QUEEN'S INDIAN DEFENSE

(Colle System by transposition)
PCO: page 270, column 112

| V. Pirc <br> Yugoslavia |  |  | A. O'Kelly <br> Belgium |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| White |  |  |  |

This opening is generally listed as a variation of the Queen's Indian Defense. It deserves independence, however, for its peculiar combination of Colle System features for White and the Queen's Indian for Black. A name such as ColleQueen's Indian seems to be suitable.


Vasya Pirc

## 8 P-QR3

A pet continuation of Rubinstein's, it prepares for $9 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$, PxP 10 PxP , without permitting $10 \ldots \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QN} 5$.

$$
8 \text {. . . . }
$$

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

8 . . . P-Q4 is a good alternative, the more so as it renders 8 P-QR3 almost useless.

$$
\begin{array}{rll}
9 \mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{P} & \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2 \\
10 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1 & \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 4
\end{array}
$$

Black has an idea which proves to be too pretentious. $10 \ldots \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ is better.

$$
11 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 4!
$$

$$
\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 5
$$

Would you expect this move to lose the game? White ingeniously demonstrates that he gets a great advantage at least. Correct is 11 . . O-O.

12 BxN !
$Q \times B$


## 13 P-Q5!!

The mobility of White's center is vital. Black is in a dilemma.

$$
13 \text {. . . . }
$$

13 . . . PxP 14 N-K3 also favors White -though to a lesser extent:
(1) $14 \ldots \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} 15 \mathrm{NxP}$ and White wins a piece $(15 \ldots \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 316 \mathrm{NxB} \hat{\mathrm{i}}, \mathrm{NxN}$ 17 BxP t, etc.);
(2) $14 \ldots \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 115 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5$ with a decisive advantage for White;
(3) $14 \ldots \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} 15 \mathrm{NxP}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ and, though Black stands badly, he can put up some sort of fight.

## 14 QN-K5!!

Black is in new peril as his Queen is cut off and seriously endangered (by 15 P-KN3 as in the game). But the main point of the text move is that $14 \ldots$. BxP fails against $15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5$ !
(1) $15 \ldots \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} 16 \mathrm{NxQP}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 117$ $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 6 \dagger$ and White wins the exchange;
(2) 15 . . B-QB3 $16 \mathrm{BxB}, \mathrm{PxB}$ (forced) $17 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 7 \uparrow, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 118 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 7$ with a winning attack since White threatens Black's Queen by $19 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 7 \dagger$ or $19 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 6 \dagger$.
$\qquad$ P-QR3
There is no conceivable defense anymore. 14 . . . PxP $15 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 4, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 316 \mathrm{~N}-$ B 5 or 16 Q-R4 also wins for White.

15 P-KN3!
Q-R3
After $15 \ldots$ Q-B3 $16 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 4$, Black's Queen is trapped at once.
$16 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 4$
Q-R4

The situation is much the same after 16 . . Q-R6 17 N/3-K5.

17 N/3-K5
White threatens $18 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 6 \dagger$.
17 ....
P-N3
18 B-K2
....

Again, the threat is $19 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 6 \dagger$.

$$
18 \ldots \quad Q-B 4
$$

This move loses-instantly.
More interesting is $18 \ldots$. Q-R6 19 $B-B 1, Q-R 4$. White then has a number of enticing continuations which are not conclusive: $20 \mathrm{PxP}, \mathrm{QPxP} 21 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q7} \mathrm{\dagger}, \mathrm{~K}-$ B1 or 20 NxQP, KxN 21 PxP $\ddagger, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 1$ or $20 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 6, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 421 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$. Yet there is a convincing move: $20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ ! after which White maintains a winning, positional advantage in addition to the immediate threats of $21 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ and 21 PxP.

## 19 P-Q6!

## Resigns

The threat is $20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ : e.g., $19 \ldots$ B-KB1 20 B-Q3, Q-N4 $21 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4$ $22 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 6$ mate.

## The Thermopylae Theme

The idea of holding up Black's entire army by anchoring a Pawn on K6 reminds us of the strategy adopted by Leonidas at Thermopylate.

There are many examples of the theme in chess, but this is particularly striking as it involves the sacrifice of a piece. It is also an apt illustration of O'Kelly's intelligent style.

## ALEKHINE'S DEFENSE PCO: page 5, column 13

## A. O'Kelly

## Belgium

H. Golombek Great Britain
White
Black

| 1 | P-K4 | N-KB3 | 3 | P-Q4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |$\quad$ P-Q3

An unusual set-up but too slow for so aggressive a defense as the Alekhine. The normal line is $4 \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5$.

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

An interesting, strong move. White threatens 6 Q-B3 (or even 6 NxBP ), prepares for $6 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB4} 4$ and virtually prevents 5 ... PxP-as 6 PxP with the threat of $7 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ is embarrassing for Black.


Alberic O’Kelly de Galway

$$
5 \ldots \quad \text { P-KB3 }
$$

Black hopes for relief by forcing White to exchange his King Pawn.

$$
6 \text { P-QB4! } \quad N-N 3
$$

Better chances lie in 6 . . . PxN 7 PxN, PxP 8 PxP, B-N2-e.g., 9 P-K6, P-B3 $10 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$ ! (not $10 \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ ? 11 Q-KR3!).


## 7 P-K6!!

A long-term sacrifice-rare indeed so early in a modern opening.

| $7 \times-\mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{N}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 8 P Q | $\ldots$ |

White threatens $9 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3$ and his sacrifice is obviously correct. For it will cost Black at least a piece to get the bulk of his army into action.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
8 \ldots \text { P-QR4 } & \quad \text { B-N } \\
9 \text { P- }
\end{array}
$$

White wins a tempo for developing his Queen Rook because of the threat to recover his piece by 10 P-R5.
10 P-R4!
P-QR4
11 RxP
PxP

An understandable decision. Black fails, however, to gain his main objective: the elimination of White's King Pawn. $11 \ldots \mathrm{QN}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ is therefore a comparatively better try.

| $12 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $13 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 4$ | $\ldots$. |

The threat is 14 RxP !

## 13 . . . <br> Q-B1

Black parries the threat by his own counter-threat on White's King Pawn. He can follow through, too, with $14 \ldots$ $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ or . . . N-Q1, and White cannot easily meet this threat. Yet O'Kelly finds an interesting way to do so.

```
14 R-QR3! N-Q5
15 R-K3!
```

White sacrifices the exchange but keeps his King Pawn and, thereby, a strong attack.

| 15 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 7 \dagger$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $16 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ | $\mathrm{~N} \times \mathrm{R} \dagger$ |  |
| 17 BxN | $\ldots$ |  |
| Again, the threat is (18) | $\mathrm{RxP}!$ |  |
| 17 | $\ldots \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ |  |
| 18 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | BXB |

Now it is easy for White; correct is 18 . . . B-B3.

19 QxB
R-K1


20 P-B5!
The rest is rather simple. Not only the Knight but some Pawns, too, must fall.

| 20 |  | QxP | 31 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{R} 3$ | R-K8 $\dagger$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{N}$ | Q-N6 $\dagger$ | 32 | K-Q2 | R-QR8 |
| 22 | K-B1 | R-QB1 | 33 | NxP | R-B3 |
| 23 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $Q \times P / 3$ | 34 | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 5$ | R-KN8 |
| 24 | $Q \times Q$ | $P \times Q$ | 35 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{R} 3$ | R-KR8 |
| 25 | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ | R-B4 | 36 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | R-R7 |
| 26 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 7$ | R-KN4 | 37 | K-K3 | R-Q3 |
| 27 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | R-K4 | 38 | K-Q4 | R-R5 $\dagger$ |
| 28 | B-Q3 | R-B1 | 39 | P-KN4 | R-R7 |
| 29 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | P-Q4 | 40 | N-Q3 | R-KB3 |
| 30 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | P-KN4 | 41 | P-B4 | Resigns |

## Ressurection

Round 5 was very satisfactory to the organizers of the tournament because of the large crowd that came to see Euwe play Reshevsky. Dutchmen are not inclined to chauvinism. They came merely to see the better man win-hoping only that it might be Euwe. Their hope did not last for long, however, as everyone realized that Reshevsky was going to win-after Euwe's faulty ninth move permitted Reshevsky to launch an obviously irresistible King-side attack. How terrible! Many of the spectators would have preferred to leave: it was not what they had paid to see.

Euwe deliberated long over his next few moves, but it seemed to make no difference. The last of the experts who pronounced him dead was Najdorf. He happened to come along after White's move 16. "Now it is definitely over," he said, somewhat sourly.


Dr. Max Euwe
Former World Champion

But it was not. Two moves later, Euwe traded two pieces for a Rook and two Pawns, then swapped Queens and held his own in the end-game despite Reshevsky's two Bishops.

Here is the game-exciting and, in all, Euwe's best performance in the tournament. White never had what he seemed to have.

## NIMZOINDIAN DEFENSE

PCO: page 244, column 34

## S. Reshevsky

United States
White
Dr. M. Euwe

| 1 P-Q4 | N-KB3 | 3 N-QB3 | B-N5 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 2 P-QB4 | P-K3 | 4 Q-B2 | P-B4 |
|  |  | 5 PxP | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |

An additional possibility to those treated in PCO. It has its points.

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

$\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{R} 3$
This is one of those points. While 5 . . N-R3 6 P-QR3, BxN $\dagger 7$ QxB, NxP $\$ \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ favors white, the text offers reasonable chances since White is no longer ready for $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$.

| 7 | $B-Q 2$ | $N \times P$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 8 | $P-Q R 3$ | $B \times N$ |
| 9 | $B \times B$ | $P-Q N 3$ |

Black's last may not be a decisive error, but it is highly questionable. The safe line is $9 \ldots$ QN-K5.

$$
10 \text { N-N5! }
$$

Here we are at the point where it seems Black is busted. What can he do against the threat of 11 BxN , followed by mate? 10 . . P-N3, which is apparently forced, leads to a lamentable position after $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 4$.

10 ...
R-K1!
A surprising expedient. Black can afford $11 \mathrm{BxN}, \mathrm{QxB} 12$ QxP $1, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1$ as then he threatens both $13 \ldots$ QxN and $13 \ldots$ QxNP.

## 11 P-QN4

But what now? Black stands very badly after $11 \ldots \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 3$ or $11 \ldots \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 2$.

11 P-KR3!
Again, Black finds the only playable move. He keeps doing so during the next few moves. But his game seems to be deteriorating nonetheless.



This is where Najdorf gave up hope. The threat is, of course, $17 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 5$.

$$
16 \ldots \quad B-N 2
$$

Now White must watch the possibilities of $17 \ldots$ N-K5 and $17 \ldots$ B-K5 (e.g., 17 P-B3? N-K5!).

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

N-K5!
The saving combination (which only looks like a sacrifice). White must take, for 18 Q-R3, K-B1 favors Black: e.g., 19 $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 8 \dagger, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 220 \mathrm{BxP}$ ? Q-R4 $\dagger$ and Black wins.

| 18 R×N | BxR | 20 Q-N2 | Q-R3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 19 QxB | QxP | 21 Q-R3 | QxQ |
|  |  | 22 BxQ | QR-N1 |

This ending offers about even chances, though it is far from drawish.

| 23 | KB-N2 | K-B1 | 26 | K-B2 | R-KR1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24. | K-Q2 | K-K2 | 27 | B-B3 | R-R5 |
| 25 | P-B4 | P-B3 | 28 | R-KN1 | K-B2 |
|  |  |  | 29 | P-B5 |  |

White is eager to breach the opposing Pawn front in order to increase the activity of his Bishops.
$29 \ldots$
Not $29 \ldots$$\quad$ RxP $\quad$ because of $30 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} \dagger \dagger$, K-B1 31 BxP !

$$
\begin{array}{lc}
30 \mathrm{PxP} \mathrm{\dagger} & \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P} \\
31 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4 & \cdots \cdot
\end{array}
$$

31 RxP, P-Q4! rather favors Black.

$$
31 \ldots \quad \text { P-N4 }
$$

Now 31 . . . R-KR1 leads, after $32 \mathrm{~K}-$ $\mathrm{N} 3, \mathrm{RxB} \dot{1}$, to almost the same position as does the text. Observe that White cannot then try 32 RxP because of $32 \ldots$. RxB $\dagger 33 \mathrm{KxR}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 6$.

32 R-KR1!
$\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}+$ !
Just when White has again reached a promising position, he is stopped for the second time by a little combination.

## 33 KxR

K-K4
Euwe now proposed a draw. Reshevsky refused but proposed a draw himself a few moves later.

| 34 | R-KB1 | R-KB1 | 37 | R-K1 $\dagger$ | K-B3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 35 | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | P-B4 | 38 | K-B4 | R |
| 36 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | RxP | 39 | K-B3 | Dra |

For story of the Amsterdam Tournament, see page 44, February issue. Also, the Reshevsky-Najdorf game is on page 47.

## HOROWITZ ON TOUR

NTEW YEARS day, January 1, 1951, ushered in Chess Review's editor, Horowitz' tenth cross country tour. Host to the first engagement was the Germantown YMCA Chess Club of Philadelphia, and then followed sixteen bookings in order at Washington, D. C., Pittsburgh, Pa., Columbus, O., Charleston, W. Va., Cincinnati, O., Louisville, Ken., St. Louis, Mo., Decatur, III., Milwaukee, Wisc., Rockford, Ill., Cleveland, O., Buffalo, N. Y., Rochester, N. Y., Syracuse, N. Y. and Charlottesville, Va.

Average attendance at lecture and simultaneous play was thirty, which, considering the cold spell, was a record turnout. Playing strength, particularly among the younger generation, has increased enormously.

An assortment of games follows. An old variation of the Vienna was essayed in the Wentworth and Dietz games, but branched off at Black's 5th move. A few deft strokes shattered Wentworth's routine defense, whereas precision play gave Dietz an overwhelming opening, from which Horowitz never recovered.

Horowitz--Neff followed a line of the French Defense recommended by Rubinstein. Black, however, projected his King Rook Pawn on move 13 and created an easy target. Horowitz-Schwartz was a wild melee and the Boyer-Allison game, though brilliant, was spoiled by a blunder on Black's 25 th.

## Rockford; Illinois <br> VIENNA GAME

I. A. Horowitz White

| 1 | P-K4 | P-K4 | 24 | P-B4 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | N-KB3 | 25 | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| 3 | P-B4 | P-Q4 | 26 | K-B2 | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| 4 | P-Q3 | $P \times B P$ | 27 | K-K3 | K-B3 |
| 5 | BxP | $P \times P$ | 28 | K-K4 | K-K3 |
| 6 | $P \times P$ | $Q \times Q_{\dagger}$ | 29 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 4$ | P-KN3 |
| 7 | $R \times Q$ | B-QN5 | 30 | P-KN4 | K-Q3 |
| 8 | BxP | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N} \dagger$ | 31 | K-B4 | K-K3 |
| 9 | P×B | O-O | 32 | K-N5 | K-B2 |
| 10 | B-Q3 | R. K 1 | 33 | P-R5 | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 2$ |
| 11 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | B-N5 | 34 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| 12 | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $E \times N$ | 35 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$ | P-R3 |
| 13 | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $N \times P$ | 36 | P-R4 | P-R4 |
| 14 | B-QB4 | N-KB3 | 37 | P-B3 | K-B2 |
| 15 | B-K5 | QN-Q2 | 38 | K-R6 | K-B3 |
| 16 | $Q R \times N$ | $N \times R$ | 39 | K-R7 | K-N4 |
| 17 | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P} \dagger$ | K-R1 | 40 | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 7$ | K×P |
| 18 | $B \times R$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ | 41 | $K \times P$ | K-B5 |
| 19 | B-Q4 | K-N1 | 42 | K-B6 | K-K5 |
| 20 | R-Q1 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | 43 | K-K6 | K-Q6 |
| 21 | K-B1 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{R} 5$ | 44 | K-Q5 | KxP |
| 22 | R-K1 | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} \dagger$ | 45 | $K \times P$ | K-N6 |
| 23 | $K \times R$ | P-QN3 | 46 | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 5$ | Resigns |



At Cincinnati, CHESS REVIEW editor, I. A. Horowitz, met 32 players at the Hotel Sheraton-Gibson. He won 30, drew with Condit Brown and 11-year-old Juliette Slutz (facing Horowitz in picture) who had to leave early.

## Pitłsburgh, Pennsylvania

VIENNA GAME

| I. A. Horowitz |  |  |  | Paul Dietz |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White |  |  |  | Black |  |
| 1 | P-K4 | P-K4 | 18 | B-Q1 | N-K5 |
| 2 | N-QB3 | N-KB3 | 19 | Q-B1 | N/5-N6 $\dagger$ |
| 3 | P-B4 | P-Q4 | 20 | BxN | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{B} \dagger$ |
| 4 | P-Q3 | PxBP | 21 | K-N1 | Q-B4 $\dagger$ |
| 5 | BxP | B-QN5 | 22 | K-R2 | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{R}$ |
| 6 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | 23 | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{N}$ | R-K2 |
| 7 | B-Q2 | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N}$ | 24 | R-B1 | R/1-K1 |
| 8 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ | O-O | 25 | Q-N2 | B-B1 |
| 9 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1 \dagger$ | 26 | Q-B3 | P-QN4 |
| 10 | B-K2 | Q-K2 | 27 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | PxP |
| 11 | P-B4 | N-KB3 | 28 | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | B-R3 |
| 12 | B-N5 | QN-Q2 | 29 | R-B4 | R-K8 |
| 13 | Q-Q2 | P-KR3 | 30 | B-B3 | R/1-K3 |
| 14 | B-B4 | N-B4 | 31 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 4$ | P-N4 |
| 15 | P-KR3 | B-B4 | 32 | R-Q4 | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N}$ |
| 16 | K-B1 | QR-Q1 | 33 | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ | Q-Q3 $\dagger$ |
| 17 | R-K1 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{R} 4$ | 34 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | R/3-K7 $\dagger$ |
|  |  |  |  | Resign |  |


| 1 | P-K4 | P-K3 | 10 | R-Q1 | BxN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | P-Q4 | P-Q4 | 11 | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ | N×B |
| 3 | N-QB3 | PxP | 12 | QxN | N-B3 |
| 4 | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | N-Q2 | 13 | Q-K2 | P-KR3 |
| 5 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | KN-B3 | 14. | P-QN3 | P-B3 |
| 6 | B-Q3 | B-K2 | 15 | N-K5 | Q-B2 |
| 7 | O-O | P-QN3 | 16 | R-Q3 | QR-Q1 |
| 8 | Q-K2 | B-N2 | 17 | R-N3 | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| P-B4 |  | O-O | 18 | BxRP | R-K5 |
|  |  |  | 19 | BxNP | Resigns |

$\begin{array}{lr}\text { I. A. Horowitz Paul Dietz } \\ \text { White } & \text { Black }\end{array}$

## I. A. Horowitz <br> White

Washington, D. C.
SICILIAN DEFENSE
I. A. Horowitz

## White

S. Schwartz

| 1 | P-K4 | P-QB4 | 17 | P-KB3 | B-B4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | N-KB3 | N-QB3 | 18 | Q-R4 $\dagger$ | K-N1 |
| 3 | P-Q4 | PxP | 19 | B-K4 | BxB |
| 4 | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}$ | N-B3 | 20 | PxB | P-B4 |
| 5 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | P-K4 | 21 | R-KR3 | P-B5 |
| 6 | N-B3 | B-N5 | 22 | Q-R7 $\dagger$ | K-B2 |
| 7 | B-Q3 | P-Q4 | 23 | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$ | K-K1 |
| 8 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | N×P | 24 | Q-N6 $\dagger$ | K-Q1 |
| 9 | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{N}$ | 25 | Q-N5 $\dagger$ | K-B1 |
| 10 | PxN | BxP | 26 | BxP | $\mathbf{R \times R} \dagger$ |
| 11 | R-N1 | O-O | 27 | KxR | Q-Q8 $\dagger$ |
| 12 | R-N3 | B-Q5 | 28 | K-B2 | QxP $\dagger$ |
| 13 | $\mathrm{BxP} \dagger$ | K-R1 | 29 | K-N3 | Q-Q6 $\dagger$ |
| 14 | NxB | QxN | 30 | K-B4 | Q-Q7† |
| 15 | B-Q3 | B-N5 | 31 | K-B5 | Q-Q2 $\dagger$ |
| 16 | Q-K1 | Q-Q2 | 32 | K-B4 <br> Drawn | Q-Q7 $\dagger$ |
| Buffalo, New York RUY LOPEZ |  |  |  |  |  |
| I. A. Horowitz |  |  | Boyer and |  | Allison |
| White |  |  |  |  | Black |
| 1 | P-K4 | P-K4 | 14 | Q-Q2 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| 2 | N-KB3 | N-QB3 | 15 | PxP | Q-N1 |
| 3 | B-N5 | P-QR3 | 16 | QR-K1 | Q-N2 |
| 4 | B-R4 | P-Q3 | 17 | B-R6 | QR-K1 |
| 5 | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{N} \dagger$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ | 18 | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ | K×B |
| 6 | P-Q4 | P-B3 | 19 | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ | Q-N3 $\dagger$ |
| 7 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{R} 4$ | B-K3 | 20 | K-R1 | K x R |
| 8 | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | P-N3 | 21 | N-K4 $\dagger$ | K-N2 |
| 9 | N-QB3 | B-N2 | 22 | Q-B3 $\dagger$ | K-R3 |
| 10 | P-B4 | PxBP | 23 | Q-R3 | K-N2 |
| 11 | P-Q5 | B-B2 | 24 | Q-B3 $\dagger$ | K-R3 |
| 12 | BxP | N-K2 | 25 | P-KN4 | BxP? |
| 13 | B-K3 | O-O | 26 | P-N5 $\dagger$ | K-R4 |
|  |  |  | 27 | Q-R3 | Resigns |

Activitles of CHESS REVIEW Postal Chess players: game reports \& ratings, names of new players, prize-winners, selected games, tourney instructions \& editorial comment.

## POSTAL SCRIPTS

## The New Tourney

It is, perhaps, a bit early to judge the merits of the new system being used in the 1951 Prize Tourney. There are not many sections in play yet-barely twenty counting incomplete ones. And seven were made up all at once with the start of the new system when February ratings took effect. So we may yet turn up "bugs" to be eliminated.
Still, what we regard as the cardinal merit of the system is shaping up well. The assignments do follow promptly on our receipt of orders-with but one exception. We do have to hold up the first order received when a new section is forming. But that is the one, real hitch.
To explain that hitch briefly, when we have filled one far western, Class B section (which seems to be about the slowest group to form), the next Class B order from the far west must stand till a second arrives-possibly as long as two weeks. Thereafter, however, each such order is filled within a day of its receipt here. So, while No. I has had to wait, none of the others do. And No. 1 gets a start at play in two weeks, his complete assignment, say, in six weeks, if we assume the same rate of receipt of orders.
Even for No. 1, therefore, there is a distinct gain. He gets his whole assignment within the time it takes for three other orders to come in-instead of six others as in the old-style Prize Tourney. And he gets a start at play much earlier. The others, of course, should have no real cause for complaints.
In fact, if the system holds up as well as it now seems to do, we shall consider running the Class Tourney the same way by next year. As the factor involved is the sort on which we are most likely to get no comments at all-if it does work well -we shall appreciate comments from the players who have tried Prize Tourney sections under the new style-and like them. We hear from the others as a matter of zourse.
As a matter of fact, we like to know you think of us-so either kind of comment is welcome, particularly when it contains constructive suggestions.

## As to "Bugs"

The only "bugs" in the new-style Prize Tourney which we can see now are those which might come from lack of cooperation by the players. We ask you to note and to try to observe these points:

First, when you receive your assignment with instructions to send your first move to others already in a section, please do send your move promptly.

Second, introduce yourself properly by stating your section number (51-P 1 or 51-P 61) and by giving your return address clearly.

Third, give your rating, which is typed after your name on your assignment sheet.

Finally, apply for a section only if you are quite sure you will and can continue play in it to a finish.

The reasons for the first two points should be obvious. As to the ratings, it is true that your assignment sheet bears the ratings for all so far in the section; but those who entered ahead of you do not have your rating and-just as you do-they want to know how your games with them will affect ratings. (If you have not thought to give your rating to such opponents, please do so with the next move that you send them.)

As to the last point--which applies as well to all our tourneys-we really ought not to have to state it all. Yet we do. There are few things so exasperating in postal play as to have an opponent drop out after a game has barely begun. And it seems so pointless for a player to pay an entry fee only to forfeit it. But a surprising number of players-if they can be called players-do apply for entry, then, within a week or two, write hurriedly to cancel their entry or to withdraw from their assignment. There are some genuinely unforeseeable emergencies, of course, and they cannot be helped. But, from the number of such withdrawals, we sometimes wonder if the mental process is not one of "Good! I'm going to Europe next week; so now's my chance to squander a couple of bucks by entering a postal tourney." We can and do make replacements for early withdrawals from orders which have come in meanwhile. But why make it necessary?

## NEW POSTALITES

Newcomers should state their "class" (or experience) on applying for entry to tournaments. If not, assignment is delayed till we can establish their class.

The following players, starting in Postal Chess during January, commence with these initial ratings:
Class A at 1300: T. A. Baracket, R. F. Jolly, Pfc. G. Krauss, E. S. Maguire, G. C. Miller, D. Nieder, A. B. Olmore, H. Siller, L. P. Vichules, S. Zilius and A. Zimmerman;

Class B at 1200: R. Alferi, J. Bajorek, M. Bender, E. Billman, Jr., E. Billman, Sr., H. H. Brimmer, R. Cutforth, W. W. Fenner, L. E. Graff, R. Greengard, J. Hartigan, L. Heeney, E. T. Leininger, T. H. Mansell, W. R. McVay, E. J. McVoy, H. W. Peterson, B. Y. Rhodes, C. W. Rider, H. Robinson, C. W. Scherr, M. Szold and F. Varga;
Class C at 900: K. Bach, C. Bell, M. C. Bionde, R. E. Bleakley, E. Cadena, H. H. Clark, M. T. Conway, L. T. Cronk, C. N. Davis, E. Dunlevy, Dr. R. M. Fonner, H. E. Gregory, G. A. Harrison, C. S. Heskett, E. Hoeflin, F. Ling, H. H. Long, W. J, Mages, Cpl, H. I. McFadden, G. W, Mitchell, F. Murray, G. E. von Petrokovich, B. Raiz, E. W. Rideout, A. E. Riemann, J. Sirota, Helen M. Smith, S. Smith, Lois Smyers, E. W. Staser, W. Stephan, D. M. Stevens, D. Q. Stone, Mrs. P. O. Suter, H. F. Tepker and F. Wystrach;
Class D at 600: G. H. Adams, Dr. J. D. Anderson, S. Bates, F. Bionde, Mrs, C. Boutwell, A. Breed, T. D. Brock, F. Bucar, R. G. Bull, W. Campbell, D. J. Chase, R. J. Chase, A. W. Eade. R. Henry, W. Holt, W: S, Howard, M. Jacobson, Mary E. Knight, R. Leonard, D. Matzke, J. McNamara, E. Menkes, P. Moore, A. Nickel, J. H. Norton, G. Pelich, R. L. Porter, J. Pritchard, P. D. Rager, E. L. Reeker, J. K. Walrath, Mrs, J. C. Walters, C. K. Waterman, C. Wax, A. L. Whitcomb and J. S. Zalewski.

## FORMER POSTALITES

Old-timers who return to Postal Chess may request new rating classifications if they feel their former ones no longer representative of their present abilities. Other-wise-as for the following who restarted play during January-they start over with the ratings at which they left.
G. E. Barber 1094, C. L. Gunthorp 524, J. M. Lles 790, O. Jungwirth 1352, M. Kaplan 1182, W. E. Mellor 916, K. J. Oberman 692, D. Prather 1112, ( $\because$ L. Rice 1002, S. Rosenberg 1134, R. K. Wilkoff 932 and Cpl. D. I, Zaas 922.

## GOLDEN KNIGHTS

Many postalites file multiple orders for entries in the Golden Knights tournament, to play in several sections at once and so to increase chances for a high score.
It is necessary, however, to place multiple orders now. We canot fill them in July when we will have a limited number of sections over which to spread them.

## POSTAL MORTEMS

## Game reports received

To report your results all you need give is section number, full names of players and the outcome of the game.

Follow the pattern of these examples:
$51-\mathrm{C} 466$ Paul Morphy 1 A. B. Meek 0.
51-C 466 A. Halprin $\frac{1}{2}$ H. M. Pillsbury $\frac{1}{2}$.
Only the winner reports (or only White if the game is drawn) but report at once! Name winner (or White for draw) first and use a slip of paper free from other correspondence. A postcard is ideal for size, easy to send.

Game reports sent in time for receipt by above dates should be printed below. To spot your game report, look under your section number, first by "key" (" $51-\mathrm{C}$ "' indicating Class Tourney begun in 1951) and by number (466) in text below the "key."

Symbol $f$ indicates win by forfelt without rating credit; a shows adjudication result; df marks double-forfeits, when both players fail to submit round-closing adj. reports.

## CLASS TOURNAMENTS

Each 7-man section a tourney in itself

## Started in 1948 (Key: 48-C)

Notice: These reports close out the 1948 Class Tournament. Despite repeated announcements that the tourney was to close, we have had to score numerous double forfeits in default of reports by either player in many games. (See editorial, page 55 . February issue.)
Tourneys 1-399: 230 Seymour, Swardson df. 234 Walfen, Kilborn df; Jackson, Kilborn df; Jackson, Makens df. 249 Dowell, Slabey df. 266 Baljay, Krilov df; Frank, Krilov df; Keith tops (f) Krilov. 268 Fredgren, Murray df; Ehrman, Murray df. 269 Imagna, Stark df. 273 Applegate, Wood df. 277 Palitz, Shafer df; Palitz, Southwood df. 283 Fenderson, Twigg df. 284 Crattan, Zwerling df. 293 Brenner, Cutlip df: Brenner, Hodges df. 296 Murray, Sheldon df. 310 Hilliard, Maclean df. 317 Simpson, Waltz df. 318 Burns, Sommers df; Lockwood, Sommers df; O'Gorman, Sommers df. 331 J. Smith, Masteller df; R. Smith, Masteller df. 336 Bone, Ehrlich df; Ehrlich, Geiger df. 339 Rosenkjar tops (a) Bean, 343 Swanson, Quamme down Murphy; Fish, Quamme df 353 Bergman bests Hoercher. 364 LiPuma, Miano df. 376 Howarth, Rainwater tie; Rainwater, Stone df. 386 Gallagher, Krauth top Warren; Gallagher, Wilson df. 399 Roberts, Shilson df.
Tourneys 400-459: 404 Hoover, Thomas df, 408 Laemmel, Morris df. 414 Crowder, Oliver df. 421 Canapary, Hanson df. 423 Cahill, Seymour df. 424 Barber, Yell df. 425 Cernosek, Draughon df. 433 Fancher fells Humphrey. 436 Adams, Van Eps df; Dwyer, Van Eps df. 438 Howarth, Keene df. 440 Olin. Tolmie df; Olin, Matulef df. 442 Craig, MeQuade df. 444 Jehl, Pearce df. 448 Finkelstein, Reily df. 452 Disler, McAninch df. 459 Marsh, Shannon df.

## Started in 1949 (Key: 49-C)

Notice: Games running for more than 2 years are due to be reported for adjudication by both players after 2 years plus one month. Those whose games began in March, 1949, should send reports by April 16, 1951, after checking for mutual agreement on position with opponent. Such reports must carry: (1) full score of game; (2) diagram of position; (3) statement of how submitter proposes to win or draw, If a player cannot hope at least to draw, he should resign and save himself and opponent need to apply for adjudication. An extension of time for play may be granted if we receive request for such here earlier than the two year date: e.g., for those who began in April, 1949, if request is mailed in March.

Tourneys 1-194: 30 Hacker withdraws. 43 Morrison masters Wisnom. 75 Cobb tops (f) Belcher. 91 McKee halts Hall. 92 Agnew, Wyvell tie. 105 Fisher bests Barnett. 115 Jansky jolts McAninch. 125 Stettbacher halts Hurley. 126 Mouser tops (a) Dickerson. 134 Hussey rips Routledge; Richardson with-
drawn. 135 Lynch tops (f) Barry, ties Suchobeck; Smith bests Barry. 136 Garland downs Shanor. 137 Nunnally tops (f) Smith. 138 Lewis, Warner tie. $1: 11$ Witzel bests Baker. 143 Daniels downs Coryell. 147 Race rips Dame. 148 DeLeve downs Brewer. 153 Smith smites Roth; Willey clips Clark. 155 Hopper halts Goe; Willas whips Wyller, 160 Rockwell rips Marlin. 164 Ferguson, Long master Marshall. 166 Mouser downs Landa, Miller. 167 Meyer nips McWhiney, 169 Bolton tops (f) Hollinsead. 175 Bullington bests Rockwell. 176 Kohout tops Gilbertson. 180 correction: Hurley beat Koffman. 183 Post tops (f) Hughes. 189 Heunisch licks Ley; Raiguel halts Holmes; Rovira withdrawn. 194 Pilawski downs Underwood.

## Started in 1950 (Key: 50-C)

Tourneys 1-29: 1 Pilawski downs Underwood. 6 Wilkin whips Gouled, Gulanick. 10 Potter ties Petonke, fells Fogel; Fogel, Isenberg best Weller. 12 Dishaw downs Lydon. 14 Spear, Ross rip Lydon. 15 Ekstrom tops McCloskey, Holman, ties Clark, 17 Anderson downs Mathews. 18 Ligtvoet licks Curtis; Poff tops Theis. 21 Wildman, Ross rip Mool; Mool, Ross whip Ward; Mool tops Mulligan, (a) Brumfield. 22 Marston fells Firth. 23 Ricafrente tops Foge, ties Edmundson. 25 Chamberlain halts Houst; Finkel withdraws. 26 Underhlll halts Carl, ties Reed; Reed thumps Servis. Carl, ties Stenson, loses to Dishaw. 27 Howarth downs Davis; Ermidis, Rothman tie. 28 Jensen Jolts King; Becker wins from Jensen, King, Harris, DiMiceli, ties Del Bourgo. 29 Tangeman tops Grieves.
Tourneys 30-59: 31 Drachman nips Muto. 32 Benedetti, Warriner halt Hinaman. 36 Suchobeck bests Lewis. Pilawski; Lewis withdraws: Pilawski tops Tonar, 37 Glusman withdraws. 38 Willey tops Tangeman. 40 Winston loses to Swanson, bests Klaasen, 41 Sargent tops Plotz. 42 Farrell fells Reddy. 44 Hicks halts Houtman; Hallett tops Tremear. 45 Willis whins Nichols; Beard bests Baker: Wilson wallops Wyman. 46 Andrews tops Taylor, Clark; Savage, Hoge halt Taylor, 47 Ruby trips Tremear, Smith; Brosheer bows to Porter, defeats Thompson; Friedman smites Smith, 53 Coubrough downs Graybael. Smook; Murphy tops Wendt. Smook, (f) Leroy. 54 Gage bests Ross. 55 Musgrove tops Sinclair. 56 Morrison fells Faber; Cooke bests Boyton. 57 Coupal tops Bolgert, (f) Levine; Lapsley bows to Robinson, tops Coupal. 58 Murray loses to Rosenston, withdraws; Peterson bests Friedman, bows to Horne. 59 Hickenlooper masters Mali; Carpenter downs De Leve.

Tourneys 60-89: 61 Gary defeats Yost: Beuscher bests Sayles. 62 Woods withdraws. 64 Stafford, Guttman stop Schmitt; Guttman downs McGinnis. 65 Strader wins from Weinberg, loses to Faircloth. Beach, Rosenblum, Morley. 66 Bernhardt tops Gardinier.


67 Haussman halts Hausslin. 68 Popper loses to Hayes, ties Collins; Gargan defeats Collines. 70 Willey whips Smith, Simers, ties Nelson. 71 Garner fells Foote. 72 Ricafrente rips Roby, Hayes; Hayes halts Roby. 74 Taylor tops Brantferger; Skarsten fells Fox, La Freniere, 75 Pomper, Utter tie. 76 Perkins bests Bancroft. 77 Nelson, Swanson top Pico. 78 Nickel nips Lapsley. 79 Schwerner bests McClung. 80 Heffron rips McRae. 81 Jungerman, Ross rout Newell. 82 Couture tops Case. 83 Sidney, Winchester down Gilbertson. 84 Bowen, Dishaw tie. 86 Christiansen whips Wallick; Taylor tops Watson. 87 Thompson bests Berry, Gleason; Berry beats Hyde, McGavock; Hyde whips Wigren. 89 R. Egelston defeats L. Egelston.

Tourneys 90-109: 90 Race routs France, Shea. 91 Gleeson withdraws. 92 Herndon jolts Jones. 93 Hopper halts Collier. 95 Fowler, McGrath, Young, Neidorf outpoint Pasternack: Young bests Ross, bows to Neidorf. 96 Butterworth bests Dehlinger. 97 Albert beats France. 98 Jones jolts Dishaw. 99 Lynch tops (a) Prendergast; Bass beats LeWorthy; Robinson rips Keeney, 101 Burns bests Marston. 102 Schneider beats Berger; Bell wrings Root, 103 Coupal tops (f) Tyker. 104 Frankel tops Tomcufcik. 105 Sharpell withdraws, 106 McCallister tops McGinnis, 107 Daraklis downs MeAninch; Beard, Leather lick Lewis; Elefson resigns to Leather, Lewis, Beard, Palladino, McAninch. 108 De Lozier downs De Leve.
Tourneys 110-154: 110 Barunas loses to Willis, bests Gilbert, 111 Stettbacher defeats Millard. 114 Olsen tops Shomay. 115 Connally fells Fitch. 116 Ornstein tops Tomcufcik, (a) Collins. 118 Rogers routs Hamblen. 119 Marchner rips Rosenston, 120 Stafford stops Olsen. 122 Eisen halts Hurley. 124 Reynolds rips Mott. 127 Mead, Rosenston tie. 128 Mascari tops Powell, 129 De Lozier withdraws. 130 Glusman downs Dishaw. 131 Bass bests Hopper. 139 Zaas tops Marsh.

## Started in 1951 (Key: 51-C)

Tourneys 1-27: 13 McAninch replaces Coleman. 17 Case replaces Taylor. 22 Winston replaces Ward.

## PRIZE TOURNAMENTS

## Started in 1949 (Key: 49-P)

Notice: The same adjudication and roundclosing rules apply here as for the $49-\mathrm{C}$ tourneys (see under 1949 Class Tournaments above).

Tourneys 1-112: 18 Adams, Klar tie. 28 Hurley, Koffman tie. 30 Belanger withdrawn. 52 Raiguel tops (a) Coleman. 63 Taylor tops Farmer. 65 Porter downs Condon. 73 Froemke, Webster tíe. 80 Evans tops Matzke. 85 Davis downs Klaasen. 92 Martin tops Ligtvoet. 33 Michell masters Miller. 94 Dulicai defeats Pilawski; Norin nips Webster. 97 Henin halts Schuman. 99 Newman tops (a) Dyson. 100 Ladd rips Rose. 101 Weininger licks Laydon; Donn tops Price. 102 Meehan nips Walsdorf; Howarth tops Pilawski. 103 Eash bests Strahan. 106 Gustafson whips Bragwell. 107 Routledge rips Namson, Frazier. 108 Stauffer stops Klaasen. 109 Newman nips Siratze, 111 McLain downs Maher. 112 Lockwood defeats Miller, Immelkeppel, Gates, Wyller; McFarland bows to Miller, bests Lockwood.

## Started in 1950 (Key: 50-P)

Tourneys 1-29: 1 Hurt halts Frilling; Buttles, Warren tie. 4 Daniels tops (f) Maichler. 5 Doelling downs Noreen. 6 Howarth tops Reed, ties Doelling; Doelling downs Reed. 7 Blumer tops (a) Johnson, ties Lund. 8 Herndon halts Darling. 9 Pilawski rips Rolo. 11 Stark stops Rains. 12 Urbach bests Micca. 14 Milam bests Routledge, bows to Giasson. 16 Shay (f) tops Taylor; Zuckerman withdraws. 18 Miller downs Sheahan, 21 Castle loses to Zieten, wins from Bricker; Fidlow fells Milam. 22 Greenbank downs Driscoll, Oliver. 23 Mayer tops Ostergaard; Corda bests Milam; McGrath downs Danlel. 24 Rubenstein ties

Horowitz, Hunt. 25 W . Chapin downs Upholt. 26 Silver, Evans defeat McDonald. 27 Sirota downs Danforth. 29 Sielaff bests Little.

Tourneys 30-49: 30 Thompson tops Walker. 31 Zemke, McGavock best Le Starge; Throop tops McGavock. 32 Kagan overcomes Gorder; Schreiber tops Fryer. 33 Beuscher bests Speyer. 34 Fowler halts Henderson, loses to Matz, McHugh; McHugh, Matz rip Reres. 35 Farber bows to Campbell, bests Lapsley: De Lozier withdraws, 37 McManus, Simmons tie. 38 Fouquet bests Scacciaferro. 40 Dykes downs Druet, Cleaveland. 42 Gagne outpoints Penquite, loses to Jonas, Johnson; Johnson Jolts Jonas; Gould bows to Johnson, ties Lekowski. 43 Lester licks Frank. 44 Dawkins downs Gillis, Milam; Milam whips Veberg. 45 Phillips defeats Tremear: Emke jolts Johnston. 46 Piatigorski withdraws. 47 Serfozo tops Johnson. 48 Anderson stops Stark.

Tourneys 50-74: 50 Parsons, Sill top Mednick; Sill bests Berger, 52 Wilke whips Craig. 53 Metheny bests Austin, Dunsmore, bows to Josiah, Steinberg, (f) Jacobs; Josiah jolts Jacobs: Mishlove withdraws. 55 Marshall, Zalys halt Hayes; Zalys fells Fuchs; Calnek withdraws. 57 Nearing bows to Willie, bests Matzke, 59 Liggett, Evans top Ott; Silver downs Anderson. 60 Gilliss tops Price: Engelhardt jolts Jordan, Holbrook. 62 Harvey halts Draughon; Trask trips Huffman, Harvey; Hornstein stops Huffman, Draughon, 63 Ross, Tanier top Spencer; Harmon bests Poff, bows to Tanier. 64 Zuckerman withdraws. 72 Bolden bests Weiss, ties Lekowski. 74 Luttrell, Johnson halt Hoercher.

Tourneys 75-109: 75 Knight, Schick tie. 90 Sokoler bests Savage.

## GOLDEN KNIGHTS

Progressive qualification championships

## 2nd Annual Championship-1946

FINALS (Key: 46-Nf)
Sections 1-32: 28 Anderson halts Hohlbein. 29 Plant downs Dhein. 30 Gray stops Stone, Barnhiser.

## 3rd Annual Championship-1947-8 <br> SEMI-FINALS (Key: 47-Ns)

Sections 1-84: 15 Lauter clouts Clark; Brice-Nash nips Eddington. 21 Harris halts Flora. 31 Buchanan bests Furnall. 43 Nye nips Trull. 45 Clark clips Mullins, 50 Schilpp tops Glatt. 52 MeInturff downs Day. 54 Pixley halts Henin. 55 Kline clips Goodale. 56 Hodurski halts Harris. 59 Greenough, Scholtz tie. 61 Weiss, Linder quell Payne; Linder bests Allen, Smith, bows to Peisach. 63 Clark, Power tie: Tolmie withdrawn. 66 Gordon bests Luprecht, bows to Giles; Lane jolts Luprecht, Jennings. 69 Merrit masters Molloy. 70 Platt tops Lovato, Garner. 75 Peebles, Wyman tie, 76 Monet, Dennen down Freedman. 77 Day tops Alter; Holmes withdraws. 78 Flanding smites Smith. 79 Capillon ties Mali, bows to Zobel; McGrady tops Mali, (f) Zobel. 80 Rudolph withdraws. 81 Carr bests Millard. 82 Rudolph withdraws. 83 Henson halts Luprecht; Evans stops Stevens. 84 Define downs Huffman, ties Clark.

## FINALS (Key: 47-Nf)

Sections 1-27: 4 Pohle overcomes Knight. 6 Staffer stops Pomper. 7 Day surpasses Knight. 10 Bruce tops Coss. 11 Ouchi nips McAuley. 12 Woodbury bests McManus, bows to Gureff; Kramer bows to Woodbury, bests Knight. 13 Birsten beats Masters. 14 Fuller, Kogan tops Peebles. 15 Heckman halts Smith, Rozsa. 16 Sarett rips Runkel; Sharpell withdraws, 17 Valvo jolts Johnson; Daly, Valvo down Shantz. 18 Benedict, Stockwell tie. 22 Williams whips Bischoff. 25 Antunovich tops Tuggle.

## 4th Annual Championship-1949

PRELIMINARY ROUND (Key: 49-N)
Sections $1-125$ (closing reports): 30 Duignan, Harkins df; Duignan, Snider df; Harkins, Snider df; Harkins, Watson df; 31 Cogdill, Lasker df. 32 Bancroft, McCready
df: Bancroft, Wyman df. 33 Bradshaw, Deg-
man df. 39 Wyman tops (f) Quillen; Beard, Quillen df. 45 Sigler, St, Jean df. 59 Fixler, O'Brien df. 72 Chariesworth, Howard df. 81 Kiser, Leroy df. 88 Richard, Wallace df. 98 Eisner, Thomas df. 112 Rudolph withdraws. 118 Barry, Werner df. 125 Lund, Pilawsky df.

## SEMI-FINALS (Key: 49-Ns)

Sections 1-34: 3 Jones jolts Collins. 4 Payne bests Cox, bows to Daly. 6 Eisen nips Bagley. 9 Kraemer, Wallgren tie. 10 Ilyin bests McCurdy. 12 Gross rips Rice. 13 Soly halts Hoehn; Worthman whips Scott, Lambert, loses to Soly, 14 Silver tops Kellner. 15 Sweet halts Harshaw. 16 Willis tops (f) Golden; Austin withdraws. 18 Runkel routs Giles. 20 Birsten bests Boys; Herwitz downs Davies; correction: Birsten, Farewell tied. 22 Knox nips Carothers, Corey; Wisegarver chops Chaunt. 23 Hanson bests Charlesworth, bows to Frank. 24 Wyvell tops Talla. 26 Fidlow fells Weaver; Weberg ties Fidlow, Lateiner. 27 Evans, Prosser tie, 28 Bush, Mondros halt Huffman. 29 Bruce defeats Schmid, Westbrook, 31 Lyle, Wildt tie. 32 Morrison masters Wood. 33 Sokoler jolts Jones, Levi; Henriksen, Herbert tie. 34 Shaw, Schooler tie.

Sections 35-45: 35 Thompson tops Kaman, ties Gotham; Kugelmass whips Wayne. 36 Norin nips McCurdy. 37 Bloomfield blasts McManus. 38 Christman tops (a) Cabot. 39 Heckman halts Piperno; Piperno, Condon top Draughon; Simpson downs Draughon, Burns, 40 Weisman, Willcox, Heisig, Smith, Carpenter mob Redford; McAuley whips Willcox. 42 Echeverria bests Soucy. 43 Prosser tons Leonard; Haendiges downs Jaccod. 44 Frazier tops Thomas.

## 5th Annual Championship-1950

## PRELIMINARY ROUND (Key: 50. N)

Notice: Some limit must be set for time for first-round play so the later rounds will run on a decent schedule. A year should be enough, considering opponents are reasonably nearby; but it doesn't seem to work that way for some. Hence we are setting 18 months as the limit. To avoid having to have games adjudicated, you are herewith warned to try to finish them 18 months from that month in which your tournament section started play.

Sections 1-34: 2 Westbrook overcomes Sheppard; Stevens stops Scholtz. 3 Neff nips Pilawski, Hogan; Schuster hits Hogan. 4 Buckendorf bests Pico, Howen. 6 Cromelin smites Smith. 7 Miles tops Turpin. 8 Richter tops (a) Russell; Norris, Pilawski tie. 15 Boyer bests Pfeffer, ties Ricard. 16 Dunn downs Semb; Dunn, Semb best Gulanick. 18 Van Brunt beats Ackley. 19 Buckendorf bests Summers-Gill, De Leve, Smith. 20 Power licks Lewis. 22 Casey tops Williams. 23 Howarth halts Johnson; Watts whips Becker. 27 Power tops Schupp, Shonick; Crittenden halts Harris, 28 Siratzke bows to Chapman, bests Namson. 30 Adams downs Smith. 31 Haines nips Knight; Ludwis jolts Johnston; Hopkirk downs Dennen. 32 Gray tops Stubbs, Shaw, ties Morrison. 33 Randlett bows to Schoen, bests Horner. 34 Silver beats Arnold, Nienalt.
Sections 35-64: 36 Aronson withdrawn, loses (a) to Watson. 37 Harris ties Lunger, bests Bashore; Hacker withdraws. 38 Hatton halts Power. 39 McManus hits Hodge. 40 Grieder. Milich down Predmore; Milich tops Shortz. 41 Davenport nips Namson, 43 Ilyin downs Adickes. 44 Coryell tops Thornton. 45 Morris tops Suyker; Neal downs Dunlap. 50 Prosser tops Talla. 51 Rickless halts Hoolihan. 52 Heino rips Rowland. 53 Zander fells Ferguson. 55 Flower, Arrowood top (a) Berlemont; Hodge halts Arrowood; Semb, Hodge, Kohne, Arrowood whip Luster. 56 Hoyt bests Beuscher, Godbold, (a) Ross. 57 Capillon conks Cyr. 58 Veguilla whips Walsh. 59 Worthman nips Nunnally; Knox bests Bryant. 60 Boelmm, Kuchinsky fell Forbes; Gilliland trips Tremear. 61 Alden jolts Jenkins, bows to Durham; Adickes downs Clevenger, Wilbur. 62 Klick tops (a) Sheppard. 64 Maclean bests Anderson, Zufelt, Matzke.

Sections 65-79: 65 Eisen defeats Stark, MacDonough: Sciarretta downs MacDonough.

## \$1000.00

 IN CASH PRIZES

75 CASH prizes, amounting to a total of $\$ 1000.00$, will be awarded to the 75 contestants who finish with the highest scores in Chess Review's 6th Annual Golden Knights Postal Chess Championship, now open to all chessplayers in the continental United States and Canada.

Enter this tournament and you can win up to $\$ 250.00$ in cash-the amount of the Grand First Prize. The runner-up will receive $\$ 100.00$ ! Third to tenth place prizes range from $\$ 80.00$ down to $\$ 15.00$. Then come 65 prizes of $\$ 5.00$ each for players who finish from 11th to 75 th!

But that isn't all! Every player who qualifies for the final round, and completes his schedule, will be awarded the emblem of the Golden Knight-a sterling silver, gold-plated and enamelled lapel button, reproduced above.

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 schedule, you will receive one free entry (worth $\$ 1.00$ ) into our regular Class Tournament.

## FOR BEGINNERS AND EXPERTS

The winner of this big postal chess contest will achieve national recognition. His picture will be published in the news section of Chess Review-and he'll get a big check for $\$ 250.00$. But you don't have to be an expert to go a long way in the Golden Knights. Lots of less talented players are going to have grand fun and capture handsome prizes in this mammoth tournament. Even if you have never played in a competitive event before, you may turn out to be Golden Knights Champion or a leading prize-winner when the tourney is over. So don't hesitate to enter because you feel you are not a strong enough player. Beginners will find this a fine way to improve their chessplay.

All classes enter together in this "open" tournament, but to start your rating as a postal player, state if you are "class" A, $B, C$ or $D$ on the coupon below, if you are a newcomer. Give rating, if an old-timer.

## 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 grand time.

So get started-enter now. Entries must be mailed on or before July 31 .

CHESS REVIEW
Postal Chess Dept.
250 W. 57th St.,
$\square$ Check here if you New York 19 , $Y$ Chess Kit on opposite I enclose $\$ \ldots .$. . side of this coupon. enclose $\$ . . . . . . . .$. Enter my name in
$\cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots$ how many?) sections of the Sixth Annual Golden Knights Postal Chess Championship. The amount enclosed covers the entry fee of $\$ 3$ per

## NAME

## Postal CIIDSS KIV

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

## Contents of Kit

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

The kit also contains 100 Move-Mailing Post Cards for sending moves to your opponents, a Chess Type Stamping Outfit 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 mall and the Official Rules of Postal Chess.

## Saves You Money

Bought separately, the contents would amount to $\$ 6.00$. The complete kit costs only $\$ 5.00$. To order, just mail the coupon below.


CHESS REVIEW Postal Chess Dept 250 West 57th St. New York 19, N. Y.

I enclose $\$ 5$. Please send me a Complete | Postal Chess KIt by return mall.

I Name
I address
city
To enter Postal Chess Tournament, see pages 57 and 58 .

1
 C. Jackson withdrew.

As a result of current Postal Mortems,
the following now qualify for assignment to the Finals: E. Pelton, E. M. Westbrook, Dr. J. F. Lane, G. Monet, F. G. brook, Dr. J. F. Lane, G. Monet, F. G.
Flanding, J. S. Jankowski, L. B. Carpenter, J. H. Day, W. T. Carr, D. MacGrady, O. K. Kline, D. J. Define and L. Platt.

We must ask all semi-finalists with unfinished games to try to hurry their play. The last semi-finals section, 47A. F. Maurer 30.5, H. G. Day 29.4, W. C. Blackburn 27.8, A. G. Clark 25, and M.

66 Werth bows to Hook, tops (f) Ragan; Werth, O'Shaughnessy best Penniston. 67 Merritt beats Ayres, bows to Preo, McCurdy. 68 Wurl tops Luprecht, ties Van Sickle; Luprecht trips Trabert; Le Starge beats Luprecht, loses to McManus. 69 McNamee, Oliker best Bellaire; NaNamee stops Stafford; Huss yields to Muir, beats Grieder. 71 Blackshear halts O'Shaughnessy, Poole, loses to Hook; Youker ties Hook, bows to Smith. 27 Murase tops Thordsen, loses to Ruckert, Williams; Levy licks Driver, Murase. 73 Hurley tops Ladd, bows to Froemke; Eastman fells Fake. 74 Henin routs Schlager, Cushman, Johnson; Duchesne downs Cushman. 75 Mc Clure clips Hyde, Holmes, Dunkin, Rodkin; Rodkin yields to Dunkin, tops Holmes; Giles tops McClure. 76 Hofer bows to Robinson, ties Carrick. 77 Reeve. P. Schwartz clip Kleinman. 78 Epstein stops Rabinowitz. 79 Glass tops Draeger, ties Nelson.
Sections 80-99: 80 Namson nips McLain; Weidler withdraws. 81 Jonas jolts Spalding. 83 Schaeffer fells Fouquet, Braun, Westing; Thomas tops Sprague, Westing, ties Schaeffer; Fouquet bests Thomas. 84 Walton tops Watson; Kat\% conks Franz. 86 Henson tops Christman, ties McInturff; McInturff bows to Hinkley, bests Fort. 87 Faber fells Nearing, Thomas: Wicksman nips Nearing, ties Rose. ss Whitehead halts Otteson; Gotham bows to Godbold, bests Voas. 89 Alden downs Varn; Gleeson withdraws. 90 Barnes bests Franz; Petonke ties Draughon, tops Barnes. 91 Lieberman licks Miller, Thomas: Rosenblum, Thomas, Weininger mob Miller. 94 Taylor, Trinks tops Moser; Trinks trips Morris, bows to Dworkin; Harper halts Janko. 95 Christensen bests Green. 96 Wooldridge downs Dudley, Schlager: Raymond rips Walch, bows to Rozman. 98 Secord tops Johnson, (f) Thomas; Downing halts Hall; Thomas tops Morley. 99 Hansold halts Dotterer; Coss downs Dotterer, Fry, ties Millman.
Sections 100-112: 100 Farber fells Rosenblum; Joseph bows to Gillow, tops (a) Cupingood. 101 Manchester hits Hodge, ties Ayala. 102 Wengraf halts Howarth. 103 Cotter rips Wright. 104 Lucas licks Graybael. 106 Kohout routs Roche, Lowe; Newberry bests Roche. 108 Krugloff cracks Pintarch, Bowker. 109 Potter clips Cleere, Johnson, Shaw. 110 Rudich tops Pelton, ties Kubilius.

SEMI-FINALS (Key: 50-Ns)
Sections 1-11: 5 Kahn halts Harrison. 6 Gleason replaces Oravas.

## TOURNAMENT NOTES

## 2nd Annual Championship-1946

The first 20 final sections have all finished play. So we are asking those in the later sections to try to hurry that we may clear off prize awards. The last finals section, $46-\mathrm{Nf} 32$, started in late January, 1950. To be fair, we have to give the players in that section at least six months more, before calling in unfinished games for adjudication.

3rd Annual Championship-1947-8
Finals section, 47 -Nf 7 , has now completed play and the contestants therein score the following weighted point totals:*
Dr. S. Lewis 45.7 , R. E. Knight 33.5,

Ns 84, started April, 1950. So we must in all fairness give it at least six months more after this April, before calling in unfinished games for adjudication. But, with several finals sections already completed, time is fleeting.

## 4th Annual Championship-1949

As a result of current Postal Mortems, the following now qualify for assignment to the Finals: J. B. Payne, G. C. Gross, L. Hanson, D. Eisen and M. M. Wyvell.

No new qualifiers to the Semi-finals have come up from game results published this month. But the last semifinals section will be made up from those previously qualified but unassigned and those highest-rated players, who scored $31 / 2$ points in the preliminary round, needed to fill out the 7 -man section.

## 5th Annual Championship-1950

As a result of current Postal Mortems, the following now qualify for assignment to the Semi-finals; G. W. Buckendori (2), J. R. Grieder, W. S. Hoyt, J. McClure, Dr. I. Farber, C. P. Gray, J. E. Harris, D. Eisen, W. F. Hatton, M. G. Davenport, M. A. Kuchinsky, M. Lunger, C. E. Jonas, E. M. Westbrook, A. R. Chapman, K. Crittenden, H. Silver, J. Morris, W. L. Prosser, J. R. Kohne, W. Knox, A. Gilliland, C. Henin, P. Schwartz, Dr. S. Katz, H. T. Reeve, Dr. D. McInturff, Dr. M. Wicksman, R. B. Potter, I. E. Johnson, J. Lieberman and W. Wengraf.

## 6th Annual Championship-1951

Through January, twenty-four sections started play in the 6th Annual Golden Knights Postal Chess Championship.

## POSTALMIGHTIES! Prize Winners

The following postalites have won prizes in our 1948 Class and 1949 and 1950 Prize Tourneys as a result of games reported in current Postal Mortems.

| Tourney | - Players | Place | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 48-C433 | Wm J O'Reilly | 2nd | 4-2 |
| 49-P18 | L R Klar | .1st | 4 $\frac{1}{2}-1 \frac{1}{2}$ |
|  | ER Sill | 2nd | 4-2 |
| 49-P20 | A L McAuley | .1-2 | $5-1$ |
|  | R B Potter | .1-2 | 5 -1 |
| 49-P73 | R L Froemke | .2nd | 4 -2 |
| 49-P92 | R Martin | .1st | $6-0$ |
|  | C R Flower | .2-3 | 4 -2 |
|  | B Musulin | 2-3 | $4-2$ |
| 49-P93 | G S Cunningham | 1st | $6-0$ |
| 49-P99 | $J$ H Newman | .1st | 6 -0 |
| 49-P101 | J L Weininger | .1st | 4 $\frac{1}{2}-1 \frac{1}{2}$ |
|  | J T Donn | .2-3 | 4-2 |
|  | G W Layton | 2-3 | $4-2$ |
| 49-P106 | S Gustafson | .1st | $6-0$ |
| 50-P11 | S Stark | 1st | 512- $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| $50-\mathrm{P} 12$ | Maj R Urbach | .1st | 6 -0 |
| $50-\mathrm{P} 14$ | R E Giasson | 2nd | 5 -1 |

## Certificate Winners

The following postalites have qualified for Victory Certificates in 1949 and 1950 Class Tourneys as a result of games reported in the current Postal Mortems.


## - annotated by JACK W. COLLINS

## Chessically Proverbial

It is almost a mere side-light to the game, but it must actually have its sig. nificance in the outcome that Black moves his Queen Knight all of six times -only to put it out of the battle. As winner Beckert states: "Ein Springer an dem Rand, das ist eine Schand."

RUY LOPEZ
PCO: page 339, column 11 (b)

## Robert Beckert

White

| 1 | P-K4 | P-K4 | 3 | B-N5 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 2 | N-KB3 | N-QR3 |  |  |
|  |  | 4 | B-R4 | N-B3 |
|  | 5 | $0-O$ | NxP |  |

Tactical players seem to prefer this last move of Black's; positional players usually like 5 . . . B-K2.

## 6 P-Q4 P-QN4 8 PxP B-K3 <br> 7 B-N3 P-Q4 9 P-B3 ....

Keres and Smyslov employed 9 Q-K2, with the idea of following with $10 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ and 11 P-B4, in the 1948 World Championship Tournament.
B-K2

The Dilworth Variation, 9 . . B-QB4, is somewhat less sound.

## $10 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$

Or 10 QN-Q2.


Equality, at least, can be assured with 13 N-Q4, attacking the Queen Bishop and allowing the King Bishop Pawn to advance.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
13 \ldots & \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B5} \\
14 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3
\end{array}
$$

Not $14 \ldots$ NxP?? 15 QxP mate.

$$
15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 6
$$

White plays for the attack. $15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 1$, B-KB4 16 Q-K2, BxB 17 QxB, P-KB3! lets Black level too easily.

```
15 . . . 
NxNP
16 Q-K3!
```

Here the older move is 16 Q-K2, followed by $17 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 4$. The text aims the Queen for the King-side where it will exert strong pressure.
16.

N-B5
Fine says that $16 \ldots$ R-K1 17 Q-B4, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4$ should be investigated.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
17 \text { Q-B4 } & \text { R-K1 } \\
18 \text { KR-K1 } & \text { R-N1 }
\end{array}
$$

Better is 18 . . . P-QB4.

$$
19 \text { P-KR4 }
$$

When the Black Knight is away (from its KB3), the White King Rook Pawn will play.

| $19 \ldots$ | N-R6 | 21 P-R5 | P-B5 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 20 B-Q3 | P-QB4 | 22 BxNP! | $\ldots$ |

$\hat{\dagger}=$ check $\ddagger=$ dbl. check; $\S=$ dis. ch.


A bold sacrifice. White stakes all on a mating attack. A good decision; for, if left in peace, Black rolls victoriously forward with his Queen-side Pawn majority.

| $22 \ldots$ | BP×B |
| :--- | ---: |
| 23 PxP | PxP |
| 24 Q-N3 | $K-R 2$ |

On $24 \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2,25 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 6$ wins. But, if $24 \ldots$ B-KB4! White has no easy time of it.

$$
25 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5 \dagger \text { ! }
$$

BxN
Not $25 \ldots$ KxB? 26 Q-R4 $\dagger$, K-N2 27 Q-R7i, K-B1 28 NxB mate.

$$
\begin{array}{cr}
26 \mathrm{BxB} & \text { Q-Q2 } \\
27 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 6 & \ldots \\
\text { White threatens mate in three. } \\
27 \ldots & \text { R-KB1 }
\end{array}
$$

On $27 \ldots$ B-B4, White has 28 P-K6! as, on $28 \ldots$ BxP, the mate in three actually occurs, while, on $28 \ldots$ RxP, 29 QxR wins.

## 28 QR-Q1!

Reenforcements are necessary. Now $29 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ and $29 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 4$ are possibilities. See move 30 .

## 28

RxB
Black cedes the exchange in an effort to break the attack. But White's Pawn substitutes quite well for the Bishop at KB6.

$$
29 P \times R \quad R-K 1
$$



$$
30 \text { R-K4! }
$$

B-B4
After $30 \ldots$ PxR 31 RxQì, BxR 32 $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 7, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB} 133 \mathrm{QxB} \dagger$, White mates or wins the Rook with 34 Q-KN7†. Obviously, too, in this line, White can always win by queening his Pawn.

## 31 RxQP!

Two White Rooks en prise make quite a spectacle.

31

$$
31 \text {. . . . }
$$

Q-KB2
What else? $31 \ldots$ QxR 32 Q-R4 4 , KN1 $33 \mathrm{RxR}_{\dagger} \dagger$ and mate in three. 31 . . RxR or ... BxR and $32 \mathrm{RxQ} \dagger$ wins easily. And $31 \ldots \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3$ or $\ldots \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 1$
allows White more than one win: e.g., 32 Q-R4广, K-N1 33 Q-R6.

## 32 R-R4 $\dagger$

## Resigns

White's win was sure in a number of ways: e.g., $32 \mathrm{RxR}, \mathrm{QxR} 33 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4 \dagger$, KN1 34 Q-R6! K-B2 35 Q-N7†, K-K3 36 R-K5 $\dagger$ !

After the text, there might follow: $32 \ldots$ K-N1 33 RxB (threatening $34 \mathrm{R}-$ N5 and $34 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 6$ or even $34 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 3$ ) with a quick finish.

16 Q-K3 gives this game theoretical value, and the sacrifice of the King Bishop and sparkling attacking play make it notable.

## Philidor's Legacy

The stunning smothered mate, by which this game might have ended, must be recognized well ahead, to be avoided.

## PETROFF'S DEFENSE <br> PCO: page 130, column 2

B. R. Milam
E. J. Wamsley White Black
1 P-K4 P-K4
3 NxP P-Q3
2 N-KB3 N-KB3
4 N-KB3 NxP
5 P-Q4
Or 5 Q-K2!

| $5 \ldots \mathrm{~B}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q4}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 6 B Q | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |

Good alternatives are $6 \ldots$ B-KB4 and 6 . . . B-K2.

| 7 | $0-0$ | $O-O$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 8 | P-B4 | P-QB3! |
| 9 | R-K1 | P-KB4 |

Now either $9 \ldots$ R-K1 or $9 \ldots$ N-B3 should be played.

## 10 P-QN3

The proper way to penalize Black's last move is $10 \mathrm{PxP}, \operatorname{PxP} 11 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 3$.

| $10 \ldots \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| $11 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | $\mathrm{QN}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |



12 N-K5
This move is punished prompty. More development, 12 QN-Q2, is correct.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
12 \ldots & \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{N}! \\
13 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} & \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5 \\
14 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3 & \cdots
\end{array}
$$

White cannot save himself. If 14 BxN , BPxB 15 B-Q4, Q-R5 provides Black with a winning attack.

$$
14 \text { Resigns } \quad \text { Q-N3 }+!
$$

If $15 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ ( $15 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 7$ mate) $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{N} 5-\mathrm{B} 7 \dagger 16 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 6 \ddagger 17 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$, Q-N8 $\dagger$ ! 18 RxQ, N/R6-B7 and mate by "Philidor's Legacy."

## Book of the Month

## Review by Fred Reinfeld

CHESS SECRETS by Edward Lasker. 428 pages. 216 diagrams. 32 illustrations. New York: David McKay Company, $\$ 5.00$.

$\mathbf{I}^{\text {P}}$F a reviewer spends all of an hour nowadays reading the book he is supposed to be reviewing, he feels that he has done more than his duty. This is particularly unfortunate in the field of chess, in which it often requires years to write a good book.

Chess Secrets must have taken many years to write, and the events which it chronicles took some 40 -odd years to live through! I consider myself fortunate to have had the opportunity of reading this book three times: in manuscript, in galley proofs and in page proofs. Each reading was an enjoyable experience!
All of Lasker's books have been interesting, mainly, perhaps, because they reveal an interesting personality behind them-a man eternally curious, eager to study, examine, comprehend, appreciate. Chess Secrets is the most interesting of them all because it is not only about chess; it is also about the man behind the book-his experiences, his reflections on them, his encounters with the grandmasters both at the board and away from it. The book abounds in delightful glimpses of these notable personalities, and Lasker knows how to hold your attention whether he is discussing Alekhine's sex life or Emanuel Lasker's philosophical theories.

But the autobiographical aspect of the book, fascinating as it is, is by no means all that Chess Secrets has to offer. It contains 75 games, all well worthy of study and beautifully annotated. There are two unconventional features here: not all the games are Lasker's; not all the Lasker games are victories!

The idea of including one's losses is not exactly a novelty (Tarrasch did it in his Three Hundred Games), but it is done so rarely that the author deserves special commendation. To annotate one's losses is particularly instructive for students, for it gives them needed insight into the process by which loss is achieved (believe it or not, losing is an achievement!). Years ago, when as a youngster of 15 or so I first played over the games of Capablanca's Chess Fundamentals, I found Capa's losses much more interesting than his wins.

There is, of course, also great psychological value in seeing a master's lost
games. When ordinary mortals lose a game, they have the abased feeling of a drunkard or dope fiend. They get the melodramatic and hair-tearing conviction that they are the world's lousiest players and should retire permanently from chess, devoting themselves from then on to canasta or television or tatting.
But, when we see the (occasional) losses of a first-rate player, we acquire a more reasonable perspective. We are inspired to try again, to take defeat more equably, to be less terrified by the specter of coming failure, and the more intelligent learn more quickly that the less you fear defeat, the less likely you are to experience it.
What is really unique in this book is Lasker's readiness to give games of other players-notable games which were played in the period which he is describing, roughly 1908 to date. In an autobiographical chess book, the author is usually so eager to tell all (that is, all that's nice) about himself, that he does not dream of chronicling somebody else's achievements. But Lasker gives generously of his space to the deeds of the great Emanuel Lasker, Capablanca, Alekhine and other immortals. (Credit is due here not only to Lasker but to the publishers as well, for not every author is given the opportunity to present his work in such a comprehensive and attractive format.)

What gives Chess Secrets a lovable quality is its revelation of Lasker's passion for chess. A man of many other interests and activities, Lasker nevertheless had time for notable chess careers in Berlin, Paris, London, Chicago and New York, and played in some of the most important tournaments of his day. Despite occasional failures, he has always returned to the arena with renewed zest, to see if perhaps this time the "perfect tournament" had become a tangible possibility.
When we recall that three World Champions have died in the saddest conditions of grinding poverty, it makes pleasant reading to learn from Lasker's introduction that chess has been of great help to him in his business and professional career. For Lasker has done much for chess and has deserved well of chess. players. This is a book to enjoy, to cherish, study diligently, to dip into idly, in short, to buy and to own, of course! The book makes a very handsome appearance, and the more than 30 excellent drawings by Kenneth Stubbs considerably enhance the general attractiveness of this appealing volume.


THESE Plastic Chessmen are made of durable Tenite and molded in the basic Staunton pattern, Sturdy and practical, they are made in four sizes: Tournament Size with $5^{\prime \prime}$ King, for use on $21 / 2$ or $21 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ squares; Standard Size in de luxe chest and Standard Size in 2 -section case, with $23 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ King, for use on $13 / 4$ to $21 / 8^{\prime \prime}$ squares; Student Size with $23 / /^{\prime \prime}$ King, for use on $11 / 2$ to $13 / /^{\prime \prime}$ squares. All sizes are weighted and felted, available in Black \& Ivory and Red \& Ivory. (See Student Size above.)
No. 70-Student Size ------------\$ 4.50
No. 71-Same but in Red \& Ivory $\$ 4.50$
No. 80-Standard Size -----------\$ 6.50
No. 81-Same but in Red \& Ivory _\$ 6.50
No. 125-Standard, De Luxe Chest_ $\$ 10.00$
No. 126-Same but in Red \& Ivory- $\$ 10.00$
No. 110-Tournament Size -------- $\$ 25.00$
No. 111-Same but in Red \& Ivory- $\$ 25.00$

## CHESSBOARDS



THESE standard weight folding boards are of excellent quality, about $1 / 8^{\prime \prime}$ thick. Outside covering and playing surface are black, dice-grain cloth. Impressed dividing lines between buff and black squares. Embossed covers.
No. $221-15 / 8^{\prime \prime}$ squares .-.-.-....-.-.-. $\$ 1.75$

No. 223-21/8" squares .-.........-.-. $\$ 3.00$
EXTRA heavy folding board, de luxe quality, double-weight $1 / /^{\prime \prime}$ thick.
No. 204-21/4" squares . $\$ 6.50$

Send for complete catalog of equipment.
MAIL YOUR ORDER TO
CHESS REVIEW
250 West 57th Street, New York 19, N. Y.

# CHESS STATIONERY AND SUPPLIES 

## POSTAL CHESS ALBUM

With CHESS REVIEW's famous Postal Chess Album you can easily keep track of the games you play by mail. Makes record-keeping easy and eliminates mistakes. The current position and up-to-date score of each game are before you at all times (see cut). Score cards are removable. When a game is finished, remove the old score-card and insert a new one. Album is also extremely useful for playing over games in magazines and books.
The plastic-bound album contains six chessboards ( $5^{\prime \prime} \times 5^{\prime \prime}$ ) printed on smooth, buff board with heavy cardboard backing. Tough, long-lasting chessmen, in 2 colors, slip into the slotted squares.

Album comes complete with six sets of chessmen, six scorecards and corner mounts for cards.


No. 275-Postal Chess Album, complete with six sets of chessmen and six score cards with corner mounts
6 EXTRA SETS OF MEN-50c 12 EXTRA SCORE CARDS-25c


## DIAGRAM STAMPING OUTFIT

No. 308-As used by postal players for recording positions on move-mailing cards described below. Outfit includes complete set of twelve rubber stamps (K, Q, R, B, Kt \& P for each color) and two ink pads, red and black. This size for diagrams $13 / 4$ " square $\qquad$ . $\$ 2.50$
No. 307-Same as above but larger size, for diagrams $23 / 4$ " square $\qquad$ -\$2.75


## POSTAL CHESS CARDS

No. 351-These special cards make it easy to send moves and positions to your postal chess opponents. They also prevent costly mistakes. Diagram blank $13 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ square. Box of 300 Postal Chess Cards


## SPIRAL-BOUND SCOREBOOK

No. 304-Keep a record of your games in this handy, spiral-bound scorebook. 50 pages for the scores of 50 games, each ruled for up to 70 moves. Every page has a $23 / 4$ " diagram blank after 40 th move. Scorebook is coat pocket size $5^{\prime \prime} \times 8^{\prime \prime}$. Spiral binding and heavy cardboard covers provide writing comfort while playing-ONLY 50c EACH. BARGAIN QUANTITY PRICE: 5 BOOKS FOR $\$ 2$.

## GAME SCORE PAD

No. $305-\mathrm{Pad}$ of 100 sheets, $6^{\prime \prime} \times 11^{\prime \prime}$ ruled for 60 moves. Printed on bond paper. Heavy cardboard back - 50c EACH OR 3 PADS FOR ONLY \$1.35

## DIAGRAM PAD

No. 311-Pad of 100 diagram blanks, $23 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ field, for use with Stamping Outfit $307-50 \mathrm{c}$ EACH OR 3 PADS FOR ONLY $\$ 1.35$


## NEW TRAVELLING SET

No. 197-This new peg-in travelling set has a big playing board $8^{\prime \prime}$ square! You can really play with this set. Heavy composition board. Complete with plastic men in cardboard box $\qquad$ ONLY $\$ 2.50$ No. 199-De Luxe Model. Same pieces and same size board but comes in sturdy, leatherette case with compartments for captured men. Plywood playing board. Closed size: $83 / 4 /{ }^{\prime \prime} \times 103 / 44^{\prime \prime} \times 17 / 8^{\prime \prime}$. Complete with men- $\$ 7.50$.


## CHESS WALLETS

No. 235-Cloth wallet with $51 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ playing board slotted to hold flat celluloid pieces. Closed size: $4^{\prime \prime} \times 7^{\prime \prime}$. Complete with men -\$2. No. 238-Leather wallet. Same as above but with leather playing board and leather cover. Complete with men ..... $\$ 4$. No. 240-Extra set of men _--.-.------75



[^0]:    CHESS REVIEW is published monthly by CHESS REVIEW, 250 West 57 th Street, New York 19, N. Y. Printed in U.S.A. Reentered as second-class matter August 7 . 1947, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the Act of March 3, 1879.
    General Offices: 250 West 57th Street, New York 19, N. Y. Sales Department (Room 1329) open daily, except Sundays, from 10 a. m. to 6 p. m. Telephone: Circle 6-8258.

    Subscription Rates: One year $\$ 4.75$, two years $\$ 9.00$, three years $\$ 12.75$ in the United

[^1]:    States, U. S. Possessions, Canada, Newfoundland, Spain and Pan-American countries. Elsewhere: $\$ 5.50$ per year.
    Change of Address: Four week's notice required for chance of address. When ordering a change please furnish an address stencil impression from the wrapper of a recent issue. Address changes cannot be made without the old address as well as the new one. Unsolicited manuscripts and photographs will not be returned unless accompanied by return postage and self-addressed envelope.

[^2]:    SUPER $\$ 1.00$ VALUE Includes "Tips for Chess Progress" and "Selecto 4 Chess" by J. V. Reinhart. Send $\$ 1$ cash, check or M . ReinJ. V. REINHART, P. O. Box 865 PEORIA 1

    ILLINOIS

[^3]:    *See page 86.—Ed.

[^4]:    * As is well-known, the time control (40 moves in the first five hours) is highly unsatisfactory. Because of the advanced technique of our times, many games are adjourned in uncertain positions. Then extracurricular analysis and consultations are the determining factor.

[^5]:    * An excerpt from Fred Reinfeld's book -revised and augmented edition-David McKay Company. 264 pages, 110 diagrams, 90 annotated games, $\$ 3.50$.

[^6]:    * According to Chernev and Reinfeld in The Fireside Book of Chess, Philidor never played the defense named after him. For one thing, he practically always gave odds But he did present and recommend a line in that defense in his famous book, Analyze du Jeu des Echecs.

[^7]:    $\ddagger=$ check; $\ddagger=$ dbl. check; $\S=$ dis. ch.

[^8]:    * As to the pronunciation of Haje, if Arthur Bisguier greeted his clubmate, George Kramer, with "Hi-ya, Kramer," it would be a case of internationally mistaken identity.

[^9]:    $\dagger=$ check; $\downarrow=$ dbl. check; $\S=$ dis. ch.

