THE CALIFORNIA CHESS REPORTER

JANUARY - FEBRUARY, 1967

VOLUME XVI, NUMBER 4

Position after 24. R-Q1!

Gary Pickler vs. Serge von Oettingen Davis – October 17, 1966 244 Kearny Street, 4th Floor San Francisco, Calif. 94108

FROM:

David Lawson 111 Montague St. Brooklyn, N.Y.10002

ÏÖ:

THE CALIFORNIA CHESS REPORTER

Vol. XVI. No. 4

\$2 per year

January-February, 1967

THE CALIFORNIA CHESS REPORTER, 244 Kearny Street, San Francisco 94108 Published Bi-monthly

> Official Organ of the California State Chess Federation Editor: Guthrie McClain

Associate Editors: Gordon S. Barrett, Los Angeles; Dr. Mark W. Eudey, Atherton;

Neil T. Austin, Sacramento; Irving Rivise, Los Angeles

Games Editor:

William G. Addison

Guest Annotator: Intl. Master Imre König Reporter Tasks:

Robert E. Burger

Second-class postage paid at San Francisco, California

CONTENTS

Southern California Teams	74 - 75	Elections of Chess Officials	82
S. F. Bay Area Teams	75-76	Game of the Month	83-85
S. F. Industrial League	77-78	Book Review	86-88
Sacramento Teams	78-80	Games	89-95
Davis Rated Tournament	80	Agenda of C.S.C.F. Meeting.	95
Mill Valley Open	81-82	Tasks	96

TEAM MATCHES TAKE OVER CALIFORNIA CHESS

The team tournament season was in full swing during January and February, and the culmination would come on May 28th at Fresno when the 34th annual North-South Match would be held. By that time team champions would be crowned in the Southern California Chess League, where 31 teams competed in four divisions, in the San Francisco Bay Area Chess League where six teams competed, in the S. F. Bay Area Industrial League where 20 teams competed in two divisions, and various other areas. The annual Yankee-Rebel team match was also to be played in Southern California (May 13th at the Atlas Club).

The blue-ribbon event of the chess year in California, the North-South Match, will be held at the Hacienda Motel in Fresno on May 28th. A rapidtransit tournament will be held on Saturday afternoon, starting at 3, a banquet and membership meeting will be held at 8 P.M., and the big match will start Sunday morning at 10:00 A.M. Besides the customary awards of 5-year and 10-year pins at the match, there will be an additional ceremony - presentation of trophies to former State Champions. For those who stay over Monday and Tuesday, there will be a 45/2 tournament, the Western Memorial Day Open.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA TEAM MATCH SEASON

As the team tournament started on February 26, there were more than 200 chessplayers at the Atlas Club, headquarters of the Southern California Chess League. There were 31 teams entered, and 28 teams were there.

In Division A the team from UCLA, 1966 winner, was missing. (We still don't know last year's runner-up; at last report it was a contest between Steiner, Pasadena, and Downey.) Also missing: Downey, Russian Chess Club, and the Woodpushers. Returned are the strong Santa Monica and Long Beach teams. The Atomics team, 1966 winners in Division B, moved up to Division A. The scores:

		DIVISIO	N A				
Pillsbury	3⅓	S. F. Valle	y2½	Long Beach	4	Atomics	_1
1. Marin	1/2	Szafir	1/2	1. Gross	Α	Lajcik	Α
Parker	1	Edberg	0	Maillard	$\frac{1}{2}$	Kolin	1 2 0
3. Wollschlage	er½	Goldstein	$\frac{1}{2}$	Saidi	1	Allen	
4. Alonso	1	Milner	0	4. Mortz	1	Gysbers	0
5. Rains	1/2	Rubin, M.	1/2	Wallace	1/2	Ranke1	1/2
6. Reese	0	Kurruk	1	6. Webber	1	Thomson	0
0.5-4	_	City Town	1	Pasadena	3	Santa Monica	3
Steiner 1. Pilnick	5 1	City Terrac	0	1. Simon	1/2	Spiller	$\frac{3}{\frac{1}{2}}$
2. Moskowitz	1 2	Szirmay	1 2	2. Larsen	1	Bragg	0
3. Geller	1	Rader	2	3. Hultgren	0	Stani	1
				4. Carr	1/3	Batchelder	1 2
4. Tarjan	1 2 1	Barrett	2		2 0	Hohensee	1
5. Almgren	1	Miller	0	 Carpenter Porth 	1		0
6. Antman	1	Cross	U	Q. POTEN	T	McReynolds	U
		DI	visi	ON B			
El Segundo	1	Pasadena	5	Atomics	2½	Long Beach	3½
1. Taylor	0	Cotten	1	1. Bilibin	0	Ellis	1
Walpuski	1	Vinock	0	2. Ek	1	Swaine	0
Gojich	0	Morford	1	Freibergs	0	Hampson	1
4. Cillers	0	Cotter	1	4. Berggren	1	Razign	0
Shipin	0	Kotz	1	5. Marshall	1/2	Laura	1/2
6. Lopez	0	Killgrove	1	6. McKisson	0	Keller	1
Whittier	4	Student Clu	b 2				
1. Guadarrama	1	Ko1key	0				
2. Gish	1/2	Davidian	1/2				
Barnard	1	Lither	0	Monterey	Park	- Bve	
4. Thornton	0	Engler	1			<i>-</i> J -	
5. Kuehn	1/2	Grad	1/2				
6. Pye	1	Telingator	0				
		-					

DIVISION C

Bechteltites	0	Occidental	6	Whittier	3⅓	Pasadena	2½
1. Forfeit	0	Murphy	1	1. Hoke	.1	Wilson	0
Forfeit	0	Rogers	1	Frilling	Fk .	l Mishler	0
3. Nap	0	Evanns	1	Hendersor	0	Brown	1
4. Michelson	0	Hall	1	4. Larson	0	Metvin	1
Rotkowski	0	0akshott	1	Frilling	Ed 2	¹ Williams	1/2
6. Campbell	0	Schulz	1	6. 0'Hara	1	Crumshaw	0
Atlas	4 M	onterey Park	2	Atomics	3	Aeronutronic	3
Atlas 1. Carroll	4 M	onterey Park Jurado	2	Atomics 1. Korst	3	Aeronutronic Kitsianis	3
			2 1 1		3 1 0		
1. Carroll	0	Jurado	2 1 1 0	1. Korst	1	Kitsianis	
1. Carroll 2. Atchison	0	Jurado Portillo	1	1. Korst 2. Pearlman	1	Kitsianis Loewe	
1. Carroll 2. Atchison 3. Tumpek	0 0 1	Jurado Portillo Benz	1 1 0	1. Korst 2. Pearlman 3. Romo	1 0 1	Kitsianis Loewe Nally	0 1 0
1. Carroll 2. Atchison 3. Tumpek 4. Carlson	0 0 1	Jurado Portillo Benz Glassberg	1 1 0 0	1. Korst 2. Pearlman 3. Romo 4. Vestuto	1 0 1	Kitsianis Loewe Nally Shaw	0 1 0

			DIVISI	ON D			
Whittier Poets	½ Wh	ittier Quak	ers5½	Bechtelmites	3	City Terrace	3
1. Thomas H	0	Tindal1	1	1. Kosaka	0	Cook	1
Streeter	1/2	Bosco	1/2	2. Pavlich	0	Enriquez	1
MacCracken	0	Clifton	1	3. Tinoco	1	Cohan	0
4. Anbro	0	Franzen	1	4. Wolff	1	Patsch	0
Lewis	0	Thomas J	1	Charbonnie	r 0	Sturm	1
6. Avila	0	Hoier	1	6. Emerson	1	Baker	0
Monterey Park	3½	Atlas	2 ½	Aeronutronic	3½	Northridge	2½
1. Hurt	1	Blackmore	0	1. Tyner	1/2	Nezhni	1/2
2. Boehm	1	Blowers	0	Trautman	1	Boy1e	0
Wingfield	0	Smith	1	Coats	0	Kenny	1
4. Grabhorn	0	Nanassy	1	4. Beheshti	1	Stein	0
Rubins	1	Banks	0	Finnie	1	Virgili	0
6. Besen	1/2	Carter	1/2	Cirilo	0	Earle	1

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LEADS SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA TEAMS

The San Francisco Bay Area Chess League team tournament began in January, and the strong University of California team took an early lead by defeating Mechanics' Institute II, Castle, and Blue Unicorn. The teams looked stronger than last year, but the U. C. powerhouse mowed down the opposition. Oddly enough, however, U.C. was "lucky" against last-place Castle, as no less than four games took last-minute turns in U.C.'s favor.

n.		T			ROU	NID	TT	
	DUND		3		Mechanics' I		Blue Unicor	. /13
Golden Gate	$\frac{4}{1}$	Blue Unicorn Pruner	- 0		Addison	0	Pruner	1
 Currie Gross 	1	Thornally	0		Wilcox	0	Thornally	ī
3. Krestini	1	Blohm	0		Osbun	1	Blohm	0
4. Dahl	1/2	Fritzinger	1 2		Bourke	ī ₂	Fritzinger	1/2
5. Stevens	0	Benson	í		Capps	Õ	Benson	ĩ
6. Palmin	1/2	Wilkerson	1/3		Wood	0	Wilkerson	1
7. Farly	Õ	Clark	1	7.	Bullwinkel	1	Clark	0
U of California	a/1 k	Mechanics'II	21	Go	lden Gate	3	Mechanics'II	4
1. Hoppe	1 2	Menas	1/2		Ramirez	1/3	Menas	<u>i</u>
2. Wang	1	Grey	o		Currie	1,	Schmitt	1 2
3. Weaver	1	Bendit	0		Gross	0	Tullis	1
4. Laver	1	Ворр	Ô		Krestini	1	Grey	ō
5. Morris	1 2	Savery	1/2		Dahl	ī	Savery	Õ
6. Forthoffer	1 2	Prodinger	1/2		Radaikin	ō	Prodinger	1
7. Leong	o	Pollard	1	7.		0	Pollard	1
,								
Castle	1½	Mechanics' I		U	of California		Castle	2
 Zemitis 	0	Addison	1		. Wang	0	Burger	1
Ledgerwood	0	Wilcox	1	2.		1	Falconer	0
McClain	1	Baroudi	0		. Weaver	1	McClain	0
Hendricks	0	Bourke	1	4.	. Blackstone	1	Hendricks	0
Freeman	0	Capps	1		. Ulrich	0	Wilson	1
6. Wilson	0	Bullwinkel	1		. Quinliv a n	1	Freeman	0
7. Lien	1/2	Austin	1/2	7.	Morris	1	Lien	0
€.		R	OUND	[]	II			
Blue Unicorn	3 Ľ	of Californi	a 4	Ме	echanics' I	4	Golden Gate	3
1. Blohm	1	Норре	0	1.	Addison	1	Ramirez	0
Thornally	1/2	Wang	1/2	2.	Wilcox	0	Currie	1
Benson	1/2	Sutherland	$\frac{1}{2}$	3.	Murray	1	Gross	0
Fritzinger	0	Weaver	1		Bourke	0	Pafnutieff	1
Wilkerson	1/2	Blackstone	1/2	5.	Capps	1	Krestini	0
6. Henry	0	Laver	1	6.	Wood	1	Dah1	0
7. Clark	1/2	Ulrich	1/2	7.	Standing	0	Radaikin	1
	Med	hanics' II	4	Ca	ıstle	3		
	1.	Menas	1	Lε	dgerwood	0		
	2.	Schmitt	1/2	Мс	Clain	1/2		
	3.	Tullis	1	Hε	ndricks	Ō		
	4.	Grey	0	Ве	Imont	1		
	5.	Schoene	1	Fr	eeman	0		
		Prodinger	0	Wi	lson	1		
	7.	Pollard	1/2	Li	en	1/2		

S.F. BAY AREA INDUSTRIAL LEAGUE

The Industrial League began the 1966-67 team tournament in October with 20 teams in two divisions. As usual, the San Quentin teams are the teams to beat. However, in Division A the strong Pacific Gas & Electric team has already handed San Quentin a stunning defeat.

stunning de	reat						
		DI	VISI	ON A			
ROU	ND I				ROUI	ND II	
Bechte1	$1\frac{1}{2}$	P.G. & E	$6\frac{1}{2}$	Bechte1	6	Shell	2
Chevron	7월	KRON	1/2	Chevron	7 1	ž B Of A	1/2
Shell	5₺	Highwaymen	2½	PG&E	6	UCRL	2
San Quentin	7	B of A	1	Kaiser	8	KRON	0
UCRL	2	Kaiser	6	Highwaymen	21	g San Quentin	5⅓
D OIL	ND I	TT			DOIN	ND IV	
Highwaymen	4	Bechtel	4	B of A	1	Bechtel	7
KRON	գ 5½	San Quentin	գ 2⅓	UCRL	7	Shell	1
Kaiser	52 6₹	PG&E	1½	Chevron	7 2½	Kaiser	1 5½
UCRL	0 ½	Chevron	1½ 7岁				
Shell	6	B of A	2		6½		-
SHELL	О	B OL A	2	KRON	0	Highwaymen	8
		DI	VISI	ON B			
ROII	ND I				ROIII	ND II	
PG&E	21/3	Bechtel	5½	Shell	13	Bechtel	6½
Knights Roa		Shell	4		-		_
B of A	0	San Quentin	8	Friden	71/3	B of A	1 2
Friden		Firemans Fund			4	PG&E	4
McKee	13	CSAA	61/2	McKee	1	Fireman's Fund	7
	-		-			Fund	
	ND I			-		ND IV	
Bechtel	6	Knights Road	2		7	B of A	1
B of A	$\frac{1}{2}$	Shell	7½		4	San Quentin	4
San Quentin		Firemans Fund	0	CSAA	2	Shell	6
McKee	5₺	PG&E	$2\frac{1}{2}$			ireman's Fund	
Friden		GSAA		Friden	2	McKee	6
ROUND I,	DTVT	STON A		ROUND I,	DTV.	ISTON B	
Bechtel A		PG&E Bishops	6½			SQ Chess Nut	s 8
1. Partow	0	Bullwinkel	1	1. DuVair	0		1
2. Wilms	0	Bedjanian	1	2. Nugent	0		1
3. Steenhard		Solbeau	ĩ	3. Schaur	0		î
4. Boushkoff	Ö	Weamer		4. Treichel			1
5. Hegyi		Zvirbulis	0	5. Seybolt	0		1
6. Bigelow	1/2	Salo	1/2	6. Marks	0	Rohr	1
O. DIRETOM	2	Jaiu	2	O. Haiks	U	KOHL	r

ROUND 1, DIVISION A

ROUND 1, DIVISION B

Chevron Resch	7½	KRON Knights	1/2	Che	eckmaters	1½	CSAA	$6\frac{1}{2}$
1. Chill	1/2	Cattell	1 2	1.	Saguisag	1/2	Johnson	2
Anderson	1	Finley	C	2.	Marich	0	Blackwell	1
3. Brown	1	Edwards	0	3.	Cunningham	n 0	Peterson	1
4. Bacskai	1	Jaeneke	0	4.	Wright	0	Burtnett	1
Antoniades	1	Simmerly	0	5.	Gayton	1	Peterson	0
6. Gluck	1	Forfeit	0	6.	Passage	0	Dotzler	1
Super Shell	5⅓	Highwaymen	2 ½		iden	6½	Fundamentals	$1\frac{1}{2}$
1. Nees	0	Hendricks	1	1.	Dreblow	1	Adams	0
Bright	1	Burton	0	2.	Boehme	0	Williams	1
Kennedy	1	Forfeit	0	3.	Shegadin	1	Holeman	0
4. Chakeris	1/2	Young	1	4.	Friedrich	1 2	Grimes	1/2
5. Murphy	1	Nash	0	5.	Harvey	1	Pasqua	0
6. Boyd	0	Enos	1	6.	Henderson	1	Forfeit	0
SQ Morphys	_7	Bofa Cheques	1	PG	&E Kings	2월	Bechtel B	5½
1. Hallinan	1	Cornwell	0	1.	Yale	1	Iradji	0
Chamberlai	n0	Puechner	1	2.	Castaneda	1	Dostal	0
Hartman	1	Gutierrez	0	3.	Germano	0	Goiten	1
 Albrecht 	1	Ott	0	4.	Romero	2	Wirganowicz	1/2
5. Hall	1	Vuskovic	0	5.	Rocha	0	Cahill	1
6. Otero	1	Mahnken	0	6.	Steiner	0	Dwornik	1
UCRL 184	2	Kaiser	6	Ro	ad Knights	4	Shell Octanes	4
 Farly 	1	Morison	0	1.	Pruett	0	Emery	1
2. Quan	0	McGinley	1	2.	Negrette	1	Pearson	0
	_	Nordell	1	3	Deasy	0	Campbell	1
3. Chew	0	Nordell	т	٠.	Deaby	•	Campbell	-
	-	Olesen	0		Chute	1	Irwin	Ō
3. Chew	-		_	4.	-		•	_

U.C. DAVIS WINS 1966 SACRAMENTO CITY TEAM TITLE

by Sergius von Oettingen

The University of California at Davis participated as usual in the Sacramento City Chess League team tournament completed in December, and raised its tie for second place in 1965 to a clear first in 1966.

No.	Team	1	2	3	4	5	6	Matches	Points
1.	U.C. Davis	X	4½	3	4½	4½	4½	42-2	21 - 10
2.	Public Works	$2\frac{1}{2}$	X	5	3	4	4	3½-1½	18½-12½
3.	Aerospace	3	1	X	4	2½	4	2½-2½	14½-15½
4.	CSEA	$1\frac{1}{2}$	3	2	X	4	3½	2½-2½	14 - 16
5.	Sac.State Colleg	gel½	2	$3\frac{1}{2}$	2	X	4	2 - 3	13 - 17
6.	King's Men	15	2	2	21/2	2	Χ	0 - 5	10 - 20

The Champion team won the title as follows:

2. 3. 4. 5.	von Oettingen Leitis Barnett El Sayed Pickler Hansen Hutchinson	4½ 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 0	Public Works Bender Mattingly Norberg Austin Baugher Santos Jamieson	2½ 0 ½ 0 0 ½ 1½ 1	Davis 1. El Sayed 2. Barnett 3.von Oettinger 4. Leitis 5. Hansen 6. Fergusson	1	King's Men Arguijo Manhart Mongan Moxley Beitzuri Davis	$ \begin{array}{c} 1\frac{1}{2} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \hline 1 \end{array} $
2. 3. 4. 5.	ris El Sayed Barnett von Oettingen Leitis Pickler Hansen	4½ 0 1 1 1 ½ 1	CSEA Litowsky Norberg Forfeit Austin Saunders Shaffer	$ \begin{array}{c} 1_{\frac{1}{2}} \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1_{\frac{1}{2}} \\ 0 \end{array} $	Davis 1. El Sayed 2.von Oettinger 3. Barnett 4. Leitis 5. Hansen 6. Guymon	0	Sacramento Fauber Markman Miller Beitzuri Schools Bryant	$ \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \hline{1} \\ \hline{1} \\ \hline{2} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array} $

Davis	3	Aerospace	3
1. von Oettingen	1	Celle	0
2. Leitis	1	Marjay	0
Pickler	1	Sanders	0
4. Guymon	0	Parcells	1
Hutchinson	0	Cummings	1
6. Hansen	0	Di Milo	1

For the record, the results of the last four years follow.

1962/63 1. CSEA 2. U.C. Davis 3. Aerojet 4. Air Force 5. Independents 6. Bridge	Team $ 5 - 0 3\frac{1}{2} - 1\frac{1}{2} 2\frac{1}{2} - 2\frac{1}{2} 2 - 3 2 - 3 0 - 5 $	Board 22½- 7½ 17½-12½ 16½-13½ 14½-15½ 13½-16½ 5½-24½	1963/64 1. U.C. Davis 2. Air Force 3. CSEA 4. Bridge 5. Aerojet 6. Independents 7. Capitol	Team 4½-1½ 4½-1½ 4½-1½ 3 - 3 2 - 4 2 - 4 ½-5½	Board 23½-12½ 22 - 14 21 - 15 18½-17½ 16½-19½ 15 - 21 9½-26½
1964			1965		
1. Air Force	5 - 1	26½-15½	1. Capitol	5 - 1	22 - 14
Independents	4 - 2	$20\frac{1}{2} - 15\frac{1}{2}$	2. U.C. Davis	4 - 2	19չ-14չ
3. U.C. Davis	$3\frac{1}{2} - 2\frac{1}{2}$	24 - 16	Knights	4 - 2	18×17
4. Capitol	3 - 3	23 - 16	4. Air Force	3 - 3	17 - 18
5. CSEA	2½-3½	17½-21½	5. CSEA	2½-3½	19 - 18
6. Bridge	2½-3½	12 - 24	Independents	$1\frac{1}{2} - 4\frac{1}{2}$	13 - 21
7. Aerojet	½-5½	115-265	 Aerojet 	1 - 5	14½-20½

TRIPLE TIE IN NINTH DAVIS RATED TOURNAMENT

Ross Barnett, Stephen Sosnick, and Serge von Oettingen tied for first place in the ninth Davis Rated Tournament, held October-December, 1966. Eriks Leitis was tournmanet director.

			1	2	3	4	5	Score
1.	R.	Barnett	W8	W10	L4	W6	W5	4 - 1
2.	S.	Sosnick	W14	W15	L5	W8	W11	4 - 1
3.	S.	von Oettingen	W6	L5	W15	W11	W4	4 - 1
4.	Ε.	Leitis	W13	W7	W1	D5	L3	$3\frac{1}{2} - 1\frac{1}{2}$
5.	G.	Pickler	W16	W3	W2	D4	L1	3½-1½
6.	R.	Hansen	L3	W11	W7	L1	W10	3 - 2
7.	G.	Manhart	W12	L4	L6	W15	W13	3 - 2
8.	S.	Markman	L1	W17*	W10	L2	W14	3 - 2
	D.		L10	D14	W16	L13	W15*	2½-2½
10.	L.	Balics	W9	L1	L8	W12	L6	2 - 3
11.	Μ.	El Sayed	W17	L6	W13	L3	L2	2 - 3
12.	G.	Hutchinson	L7	W13	W14	L10	W6	2 - 3
13.	J,	Morton, Jr.	L4	W12	L11	W9	L7	2 - 3
14.	R.	Murian	L2	D9	L12	W16	L8	1½-3½
15.	J.	Arguijo	W18	L2	L3	L7	L9*	1 - 4
16.	Η.	Boro	L5	BYE	L9	L14	L12	1 - 4
17.	Μ.	Rasmussen	L11	L8*	With	drew		
18.	С.	Long	L15	With	drew			

OSBUN, WANG DIVIDE FIRST PRIZE IN MILL VALLEY OPEN

Eric Osbun of San Jose State College and Arthur Wang of the University of California Radiation Laboratory tied for first place in January in the third annual Mill Valley Open. They drew with each other and won against four opponents to register $4\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$ scores. Osbun had 18 Solkoff points to $15\frac{1}{2}$ for Wang but the tie-break was not employed to determine first place and the two divided the money.

There was a five-way tie for third between David Blohm, Richard Laver, Dennis Fritzinger, Frank Thornally and Russell Freeman (the only old-stager in the group). Fritzinger won a chess clock for the best "A" and the others divided the cash for third prize. Carl Huneke won a special upset prize of \$15 for defeating Roy Hoppe in the last round.

The tournament, an event sponsored by the Mill Valley Chess Club, was organized by L.A. Post and directed by Mike Goodall. The scores in order of tie breaking points:

THIRD ANNUAL MILL VALLEY OPEN, JANUARY 7-8, 1967

		1	2	3	4	5	Score
1.	Eric Osbun	W25	W12	W6	D2	W3	4½-½
	Arthur Wang	W13	W15	W31	D1	W8	4½-½
3.	David Blohm	W21	W10	W5	W11	Ll	4 - 1
4.	Richard Laver	W37	W18	D8	D14	W12	4 - 1
5.	Dennis Fritzinger	W34	W19	L3	W16	W 9	4 - 1
6.	Frank Thornally	W32	W27	L1	W23	W10	4 - 1
7.	Russell Freeman	W33	L8	W25	W31	W11	4 - 1
8.	Rex Wilcox	W14	W7	D4	W20	L2	3½-1½
9.	Ziad Baroudi	W16	W17	L11	W15	L5	3 - 2
10.	Curt Wilson	W26	L3	W13	W33	L6	3 - 2
11.	Norris Weaver	W35	W20	W9	L3	L7	3 - 2
12.	Roland Goudswaard	W36	L1	W21	W22	L4	3 - 2
13.	Elmo Mugnani	L2	W28	L10	W26	W22	3 - 2
14.	Peter Gray	L8	W34	D19	D4	W30	3 - 2
15.	Gary Pickler	W28	L2	W27	L9	W21	3 - 2
16.	Carl Huneke	L9	W24	W29	L5	W19	3 - 2
17.	Michael Morris	D31	L9	D32	W24	W23	3 - 2
18.	L. Jacobsen	W29	L4	L22	W32	W20	3 - 2
19.	Roy Hoppe	W23	L5	D14	W27	L16	2½-2½
20.	Raymund Wheeler	W22	L11	W24	L8	L18	2 - 3
21.	Leroy O'Doan	L3	W26	L12	W29	L15	2 - 3
22.	Frank Votruba	L20	W35	W18	L12	L13	2 - 3
23.	James Mathis	L19	W32	W36	L6	L17	2 - 3
24.	Don Hoekman	W30	L16	L20	L17	W35	2 - 3

Third Annual Mill Valley Open (c	continued`)
----------------------------------	------------	---

IIIII Ammai i	itti varicj	OPC.	O LLC T XX				
		1	2	3	4	5	Score
25. Robert Oyl	er	L1	W32	L7	W28	-	2 - 3
26. Norman Rei	der	L10	L21	W37	L13	W31	2 - 3
27. Gil Hayes		BYE	L6	L15	L19	W36	2 - 3
28. Joseph Rol	erts	L15	L13	BYE	L25	W34	2 - 3
29. John Votru	ıba	L18	W37	L16	L21	BYE	2 - 3
30. David Neid	ler	L24	L31	W34	W37	L14	2 - 3
31. Ralph Fife	r	D17	W30	L2	L7	L26	1½-3½
32. Russ Bents	son	L6	L23	D17	L18	W33	1½-3½
33. Kenneth Na	il	L7	L25	W35	L10	L32	1 - 4
34. Durham Gui	lian	L5	L14	L30	BYE	L28	1 - 4
35. James T. N	icCarley	L11	L22	L33	W36	L24	1 - 4
36. David Watt	s	L12	BYE	L23	L35	L27	1 - 4
37. James W. I	Bush	L4	L29	L26	L30	-	0 - 5
1							1

1967 CALIFORNIA CHESS OFFICIALS

CALIFORNIA STATE CHESS FEDERATION

PresidentIsaac Kashdan	SecretarySpencer Van Gelder
Vice PresidentJohn Blackstone	TreasurerDr. Ralph Hultgren

PresidentAllan Troy	y
SecretaryMrs. Carol Troy	y
TreasurerLarry Hoke	2

Tourn. Director.Gordon Barrett

PresidentH.	D. Rade:	r
Vice PresE	d. Mayh	ew
Secretary Gordon	Barret	t
TreasurerYury	Oganeso	V

CITY TERRACE CHESS CLUB

WHITTIER CHESS CLUB

PresidentH. Guadarrama
Vice PresBob Henderson
TreasurerTodd Knapp
Tourn. Director. Ken Fleshman

NORTH HOLLYWOOD CHESS CLUB REDLANDS CHESS CLUB

PresidentJoseph	h Mizrachi
Vice PresSigmund	Goldstein
TreasurerRudy	Wendlenner

S.F. BAY AREA CHESS LEAGUE

Preside	ent	Carrol	1 Capps
SecTr	res	.Russell	Freeman
Tourn.	Director.	Ka	r1 Bopp

CASTLE CHESS CLUB (Oakland)

Preside	ent	Les	Talcott
SecTi	esR	ussell	Freeman
Tourn.	DirectorG	uthrie	McClain

NORTHRIDGE CHESS CLUB

HOREIMEEDGE CHEED CECE
PresidentRonald Stein
Vice PresTom Kenny
SecretaryJim Boyle
TreasurerJohn Jahnke
Tourn. DirectorRon Stevens

PresidentSt	eve Skrypzak
Vice Pres	Greg Herlick
Sec. TresMr	
Tours. Director	Kim Ogden

GAME OF THE MONTH - by Jerry Hanken

Since my last contribution to The Reporter in 1964, I believe that my game has improved. My style has matured. It is still a counter-punch game but it is more subtle. After a terrible season in 1965 my rating is now up, and if I can avoid another State Championship disaster like 1964 it will stay up.

An

Game No. 973 - Nimzo

White	Black
W. Cunningham	J. Hanken
1. P-QB4	Kt-KB3

2. P-Q4

White was pleased to have avoided Black's dreaded "Bad Benoni."

2. -- P-K3 3. Kt-QB3 B-Kt5

4. B-Kt5

An old but tricky line, supposedly refuted but Black does not know the analysis.

4. -- P-QB4
5. P-Q5 P-Q3
6. P-K3 P-KR3
7. B-R4 P-K4

Somehow, however, Black has achieved his "Bad Benoni" pawn formation with his bad bishop taken care of. However, as the bishop must be exchanged anyway, BxKtch first, doubling the White pawns, seems better.

8. KKt-Q2 QKt-Q2 9. P-QR3 BxKt 10. KtxB Q-R4 11. P-B3

To prevent P-K5. But extensive analysis indicates that 11. B-Q3, P-K5; 12. B-B2 leads to advantage for White. Black now has time for Q-side counterplay.

11.		P-QR3
12.	B-K2	R-Ktl
13.	0-0	P-QKt4
14.	B-Kl	PxP
15.	$B \times P$	Q-B2
impor	tant t	tempo.
16	D_OV+3	3 0-0

16.	P-QKt3	0-0
17.	P-KB4	R-K1
1.0	D., D.5	



18. -- P-K5
Black must keep K4 open for his pieces or White has an overwhelming base for K-side attack with no real counterplay.

19. B-R4 B-Kt2 20. R-R2 R-K4

A hard decision, Black would like to wait for P-KKt4 and then play Kt-K4 so that if BxKt to double the pawns, White's attack is delayed by his own KtP, but if Black temporizes White plays P-KKt4 and P-Kt5 instead (i.e.20...,K-B; 21. P-KKt4, Kt-K4; 22. P-Kt5! PxP; 23. BxP and if Kt(3)-Q2, 24. P-B6! with a powerful attack indeed!) So Black decides to increase the pressure on the QP.

21. P-KKt4 Q-R4 22. R-B2 --

The Knight cannot move as the Black Knight takes the QP and 23. P-B6 is answered by P-KKt4!

KR~K1

22. ... 23. P-Kt5

23. P-Kt5 PxP 24. BxP QxP

25. R-KKt2 O-R4

To be able to protect the QP. The entire line had to be precisely calculated. This move is the key to the defense. The tempo gained allows the Queen to return.

26. Q-B2

26. Q-K1,K-B1 and Knight and Queen are still tied down, i.e. 27. B-B4, Kt-K4, i.e. Q-Kt3,QxKt 28. QxPch, K-K2; 29. R-Kt6,Kt(4) Q2 and the defense holds (with the threat of 30. ...R-Kt1) If 26. B-R6, QxKt, and if BxP,K-R2 holds, and if 27. RxRch, K-R1 holds. The Knights keep the Queen out.

26. -- K-B1 27. K-R1 --

An ill-conceived plan because of the extreme vulnerability of the long diagonal. On 27. R-B4,R-K4 is the immediate answer, but this seems to offer better chances.

27. -- Q-B2 28. KR-KKt1 R-K4

28. KR-KKt1 R-K4 29. B-B4 RxBP

30. KtxP --

Consistent but suicidal. White is so intent on the attack he underestimates the counterattack.



30. -- RxB!
Forced but very strong. The Black Bishop gets loose.

31. PxR KtxP

32. RxP? ---

This loses by force but it is again consistent. 32. Q-Kt2, Kt(4)-B3; KtxKt,KtxKt returns the exchange and Black remains a pawn ahead, but it leaves White with some fighting chances.

32. -- QKt-B3
White must lose material. There is no good way to defend the Knight. If 33. Q-QKt2, KtxKt;
34. R-Kt8ch, K-K2 and then if 35. RxR, QxR (not 35. ...Kt-B7ch?,
36. QxKt, Kt-B5ch; 37. RxB!);36. R-K1, KtxP -- and if 35. R-K1, RxR; 36. RxKtch, K-Q2 and more material goes. Of course, 33. KtxKt is answered by Kt-K6ch, winning the Queen.

33. Q-KKt2

An ingenious attempt at counterplay. Black wins the Queen for two pieces, but has considerable problems of a technical nature. KtxKt is answered by a Rook check of course, followed by OxKtch.

33. -- KtxP 34. KtxKt BxOch 34. ... KtxR is not better as after 35. R(7)xKt the threat of Kt-05 forces BxRch and the game line. KtxR

35. R(1)xB

36. RxKt

36. R-Kt8ch, K-K2;37. Kt-Q5ch,K-Q2; 38. KtxQ,RxR and Black remains an exchange and two Pawns ahead. However, now the threat is to win the Queen and have two pieces against the Rook and two Pawns, unclear at best. Black must tread very carefully for the next few moves.

36. --Q~B3

A false try, as White quickly shows. The Queen must go to R2, the only square. If it tries to go with tempo, however, 36. ..., Q-Kt2; 37. B-Q5,Q-R2; 38. B-B6! and Black cannot win and may even lose! i.e. 38. ..., K-K2; 39. Kt-Q5ch; 40. K-K3; 41 R-K2ch, K-B4; 42. R-K7! and the Queen is lost.

37. B-Q5

38, B-B4

Q-B2

White must keep Q5 open for his Knight.

38. ---Q-R2 As noted before, the only square that is safe.

> 39. Kt-R7ch K-K2

40. R-K2ch

K-Q2 Again the only move as Ol loses the Queen, once the Knight returns to B6.

> 41. Kt-B6ch K-B3

42. B-05ch K-Kt3

Again forced as if 42...,K-Kt4 43. B-B4ch and if 43..., K-R4, 44. Kt-Q5 and mate next. If 43..., K-Kt5, 44. Kt-Q5ch, K-R6; 45. P-

Kt4 and mate next.

43. B-B4 Q-Kt2ch

44. Kt-Q5ch K-B3 Of course K-R2 loses the Queen and R4 is mate.

45 R-K7 Q-B1

46. RxP 00 00 White is finally running out

of threats! 46. .. R-Kt2

Finally breaks the attack: If 47. BxP, RxR, and after BxQ, KxKt leaves Black an exchange and Pawn up with a simple win.

> 47. R-B2 R-Kt2 48. Kt-B4

> Q-Kt5

White lost on time.

A complicated and fighting game in which a fine attack gives way to an excellent counterattack and intricate defense. The game does credit to both sides. Cunningham remarked after the game, "This was the best game I ever lost."

Jerry's wish at the beginning about avoiding a State Championship disaster as in 1964 did not come to pass. He only scored half a point at San Francisco. Incidentally, we said in 1964 that Jerry was from the New York area. Correction! He came to Los Angeles from Cincinnati, Ohio in 1960. - Ed.

BOOK REVIEW by Richard Sasuly

When the late Fred Reinfeld, fabricator of chess books, approached his friendly neighborhood stationer, the clerk must have reached automatically for another paste pot. Surely no one in all the history of publishing produced more books containing less writing.

Reinfeld is said to have produced "more than 100 books of chess." This claim (or charge) appears on the dust jacket of his latest, published posthumously by MacMillan, under the title <u>Great Games by Chess Prodigies</u>. It contains a paste-up of 56 games by Morphy, Capablanca, Reshevsky and Fischer.

Emmanuel Lasker was probably the most impressive intellectual among the great masters. He was also a difficult man. One of his peculiarities was the notion that a master should be paid for his life work. In chess, game scores record the work. Accordingly, Lasker thought the players should have copyrights to their own games. This convention never came to be. Instead, we have the works of Reinfeld.

In his last paste-up, Reinfeld gave us, including introduction, $8\frac{1}{2}$ pages of hastily written text. Within this narrow compass, the reader may range quickly and thoroughly without finding a trace of thought or grace. The kernel of one idea--the appearance of prodigies in chess--sufficed to bring out scissors and glue for the hundredth time. The idea, as it happens, can be fascinating and deserved treatment. The true prodigy is one of the most remarkable rarities of human life. It is seen in pure form, so far as I know, only in music, mathematics and chess.

One might quarrel with Reinfeld's choice of prodigies, but the argument would be trivial, and endless. In truth, most players of genuine grand master class seem to have learned the game as children and played it very strongly when they were scarcely into their teens. To take a few great names, almost at random: Keres taught himself the game and then at 13 entered his first competition, the rapid transit championship of Parnu and won it. Euwe, whom one does not think of as a prodigy because he remained an amateur chess player for years, won a tournament at the age of 10. Spassky at 15 took second, behind Taimanov, in the championship of Leningrad (a tournament stronger than most national championships); in the same year, he came fourth in a major international tournament at Budapest, in the course of which he defeated Smyslov (then on his way to a drawn match for the world title) in one of the most beautiful games on record. But the list could be prolonged indefinitely. In this company, the non-

prodigy is the rarity. In his remarkable description of Rubenstein's style, Reti makes the point that Rubenstein learned the game comparatively late - at 18 - and so never spoke the language of chess quite fluently and was more prone than others in his class to blunder away a good position.

The parallels to math and music are peculiarly attractive, if mysterious. Thus the child Capablanca, learning the game at 4 by watching two patzers play, inevitably brings to mind the child Mozart, at 4 demanding to be allowed to play in the quartet - and being able to do so. Young Pascal, scratching diagrams in the schoolyard dirt and recapitulating Euclid brings to mind a 12-year-old Fischer hanging around the toughest New York chess clubs and beating his elders. There is at least one cross-over between the fields of genius; Emmanual Lasker played no serious chess in his early teens, but he was a prodigy - in mathematics.

Reinfeld presents only a handful of games by Morphy, Capablanca, and Reshevsky. Of the 56 games, 31 are by Fischer. A cynic might describe the book as a device for presenting a large number of games by Fischer without the necessity of authorization.

But in the end, the games speak for themselves and need no other justification. Fischer was older than Capablanca when he first learned the game, older than Reshevsky when he first won games from masters. If the point at issue is the achievement of the prodigy, it could be said that Fischer went father in his teens than any other (first at Portorez when he was 15, participation in two Candidate'sTournaments before he was 20). But truly the point made by the games is not prodigiousness, but very great strength. If persuasion is needed, these games convince one that Fischer is a potential champion of the world.

The games also, inevitably convey a sense of Fischer's style which can be had in no other way. In the absence of someone else's authoritative judgment, I will risk the statement of an impression: Fischer appears to make precisely what he regards as the best move in every situation. Hence he will use the same openings over and over; he evidently considers them best. He plays as objectively and flawlessly as Capablanca - but seeks the advantage earlier, and more aggressively and persistently. In his games you find no dubious moves which unsettle the position, release dynamics and give scope for greater talent - in the fashion of Lasker and some of the Russians. On the other hand, he does not fiddle or mark

time. He is not cautious but neither does he give away an advantage. He does not reveal the wild imagination of Tal or the creativity in attack of Keres, or Bronstein or Spassky. He does create the impression of having played, over the board, in major competition with the clock running, correspondence games where every move has been chosen to put maximum pressure on the opponent's position. He can thereby play games which are continuously tense and aggressive from the first moves through a long ending, without necessarily resorting to combinative fireworks. He defends as actively as possible. He is always looking for the win. And he may turn out to be the best player in the world.

GAMES

COMPUTERS PLAY CHESS

For the translation of the following article in Soviet Sport (March 12, 1967) we are indebted to Raymund J. Conway.

As has already been communicated, one of the games of the international chess match between the electronic computing machines of the USSR and the USA has already been concluded. In this extraordinary match, initiated on the 20th of November of last year, a discussion is being carried on in the solution of which mathematical principals are being employed. The Soviet program was prepared by scientists of the Institute of Theoretical and Experimental Physics, and the American program, by specialists of Stanford University. The first results were made known on the tenth of March. In the third game (four games are going on simultaneously) the Soviet machine had gained the upper hand announcing mate on the nineteenth move.

The editor of <u>Soviet Sport</u> has requested the editor of the magazine <u>Chess in the USSR</u>, International Grandmaster Yuri Averback, for commentary on the completed game.

Let's see what he has to say.

"For the first time in my life I am geing called on to comment on a chess game between machines. That a machine is capable of playing chess is a fact that is now no longer able to astonish anyone. In many countries scientists are setting up programs for such struggles. And the present match, as it seems to me, should first of all help to give a comparative estimate of the programs

worked out in the USSR and USA.

"And now let us look at the game and attempt to determine with what strength machines are capable of playing.'

Game No. 974 - Three Knights White -USSR Black -USA

1. P-K4 P-K4 2. Kt-KB3 Kt-QB3 3. Kt-B3 B-B4

The machine selected a classical old fashioned opening - the Three Knights Game. The last move permits White to immediately begin activity in the center. 3..., Kt-B3 is considered less committal.

4. KtxP!

Quite a skillful move which is considered very strong in contemporary theory. White emporarily sacrifices a piece to win it back with positional advantages.

4. ... KtxKt Inferior is 4...BxPch, 5.KxB, KtxKt 6. P-Q4.

> 5. P-Q4 B-03

6. PxKt BxP

7. P-B4

White consistently follows his plan of capturing the center.

7. ... The best reply. After 7..., B-Q3; White has 8. Q-Q4 or 8. P-K5 with advantage.

BxKtch

8. PxB Kt-B3 9. P-K5 Kt- K5 10. Q-Q3 . . .

A move undoubtedly worthy of praise. found itself in a difficult White shrewdly combines attack with defense against the check for the Queen at KR4.

10. ... Kt-B4 Up to this point the Black machine worked competently and here, with the move 10..., P-Q4; could have

maintained an approximate balance.

11. Q-Q5 Kt-K3? This leads to a difficult position. Correct would have been 11. ..., P-Q3

12. P-B5



12. A typical "patzer" move. Black does not see White's simple answer. It is said that it is human for people to err. Obviously the weakness that is innate in man is transferred to machines. With chess players one mistake often entails another. It would seem that machines are not subject to emotions. However, in this encounter the American machine clearly got "out of whack" and position. One mistake followed another from the first. Or perhaps, more simply, does it merely play bad chess?

13. P-KR4! Precisely, Now Black loses a piece.

13. ... P-KB3 Black's position is already lost but after 13..., Kt-K3, it still would have been possible to have put up resistance. The move which was made permits White to conclude the struggle beautifully. After the threat 17. BxP there is 14. PxKt PxP

15. RxP! Although not a complicated move, nevertheless very effective.

White sacrifices the Rook, but it must not be taken because mate would follow two moves later, e.g. 16. Q-Kt8ch, K-K2; 17. BxP Mate.

15. ... R-B1 16. RxP

no longer a satisfactory defense.

16. ... P-B3 17. Q-Q6 $R \times P$ 18. R-Kt8ch R-B1 19. QxR MATE

"What can one possibly say about the strength of the 'rival's' games? Black defended poorly. In all probability, this is the obvious deficiency of the program. Our machine carried on the duel vigorously and logically, manifesting a mature game. Nevertheless, let us not be in a hurry to award it a rating: for in this game it did not meet up with stubborn opposition."

Yuri Averbach International Grandmaster

(There are some strange things going on in this game. Addison's comment: "The Soviet computer is a very aggressive computer." Isaac Kashdan: " But the game was not between individuals but presumably the result of chess playing programs that were fed into the computer. .. To this editor White's consistently good moves are less credible than Black's errors." Is it that Botvinnik, et al, designed a better program, or did the Soviets have a reject button so as to have the computer try again every once in a while?

We suppose that it is an accomplishment to program a computer to play chess at all, regardless of how strongly. The Stanford computer plays like a small child, unable to see its opponent's replies again and again. 12...Kt-Kt4 places the Knight on a square from which there is no escape. A program cannot be called satisfactory which makes mistakes like this. But an even worse move is 17. ... RxP, a move which allows a mate in two. Granted that there is no defense in the position; then why not simply resign? Incidently, the USSR machine played 10. QxR when RxR was also mate. Wouldn't most chessplayers mate with the Rook from force of habit? It looks as though the computer is programmed to look at Queen moves first then Rooks and so on in order of power. -ED)

[&]quot; Our machine carried out the attack in an irreproachable manner."

S.F. BAY AREA TEAM MATCHES, 1967

Game	No.	975	_	Ruy	Lo	opez	
V	/hit	е			I	Black	
Ε.	Osb	un		I).	Blohm	
(Mech	ı.In	st.)		(Blu	ıe.	Unicorn)	<u> </u>
1.	P-K	4		I	?-I	ζ4	
2.	Kt-	квз		ŀ	۲t -	-QB3	
3.	B-K	t5]	?~(QB3	
4.	B-R	4		H	۲t٠	- B3	
5.	0-0			ŀ	۲tغ	κP	
6.	P-Q	4		3	P-(QKt4	
7.	в-к	t3]	?-(24	
8.	PxP]	3-I	K3	
9.	Q-K	2		I	۲t-	- B4	
rsen	s w	ord	on	the	va	ariation	is

La 9..., B-K2; 10. R-Q1, 0-0; 11. P-B4, KtPxP; 12. BxP, Q-Q2; with which he held draws against Geller in two of their match games.

10..R-Q1 KtxB

11. RPxKt

11. BPxKt is Ivkov's adventure.

12. P-B4

QPx P After his disaster with 12....KtxP?

Q-B1

against Osbun in the Mill Valley open B-Q3;25. Q-K4,R-K3; 26. Q-B5; three weeks earlier, Blohm now adopts P-B3; 27. BxP, Kt-Q4; 28. PxB, the best continuation.

13. PxP BxP 14. Q-K4 Kt-Kt5

15. Kt-R3

Blohm expected 15. B-Kt5, B-B4; 16. R-QBch, QxR; 17. BxQ, RxB with a satisfactory position for Black. Keres analyzed thus in his book of the 1948 World Championship but did not consider the consequences of the alternate 15. Kt-R3.



15. ... B-Kt6 16. KtxP R-QKt1 To my alarm I had forgotten Gipslis' analysis of this move. However, the following forced continuation of the game is not difficult to see, for if 17. B-Kt5, BxR; 18. RxB, PxKt; 19. R-Q8ch, QxR: 20. BxQ, RxB; 21. P-R3, B-B4, White will lose. I had expected 16..., BxR; 17. KtxPch, QxKt; 18. QxRch, K-Q2;

19. B-Kt5, BxKt; 20. QxB, B-B4; 21. R-Qlch, K-B1; 22. R-QB1, R-K1; 23. Q-R8ch, K-Q2; 24. R-Q1ch,

Q-R4; 29. B-B3 Resigns.

(Gipslis-Haag, Asztalos Memorial 1964).

17. Kt-Q6ch PxKt

18. PxPch Q-K3

19. P-Q7ch K-Q1

20. B-Kt5ch P-B3

If 20..., B-K2; 21. Q-KB4, R-Kt2;

22. R-Q6 is powerful.

21. Q-KB4 R-Kt2

22. Kt-Q4

At this point Gipslis' analysis ends (Sahs No. 18, 1964).

22. ... Q-Kt3 The most problematic defense.

If, instead, the Black Queen leaves the third rank, the

possibility of BxPch forces the	2. P-QB4	P-K3
win.	3. Kt-QB	Kt-KB3
One might expect Blohm to play	4. B-Kt5	B-K2
the ending with $22,Q-Q3$, but	5. P-K3	0-0
after 23. KtxB,QxQ; 24. BxQ,RXP,	6. Kt-B3	P-KR3
25. RxRch, KxR; 26. B-Q2, B-Q3;	7. BxKt	BxB
27. BxKt, BxB, 28. RxP, R-K1; 29.	8. Q-Q2	PxP
P-Kt3, R-K7, 30. R-Kt6!, B-K2,	9. BxP	Kt-Q2
31. K-Bl! White keeps his Pawn	10. 0-0	P-B4
and wins.	11. B-Kt3	PxP
23. KtxB PxB	12. PxP	Q-R4
24. Q-K4	13. QR-B1	R-Q1
This strong move emphasizes the	14. KR-Q1	P-QKt3
strength of the Pawn on the	15. Q-B4	B-Kt2
seventh rank and the fact that	16. Kt-K4	B-Q4
Black is playing without his	17. BxB	QxB
King Rook. If now 24, RxP	18. Kt-B3	Q-QR4
White has an attractive King	19. P-KR4	Q-Kt5
hunt variation: 25. Q-R8ch,K-B2;	20. R-B2	QR - B1
26. RxRch, KxR; 27. R-Q1ch,K-K3;	21. P-Kt4	Kt-B1
28. R-Klch,K-Q3 (if 28,K-B3;	22. P-Kt5	$P \times P$
29. Q-B3ch, K-Kt3; 30. R-K5! wins)	23. PxP	Kt-Kt3
29. Q-K8:, K-B2 (what else?); 30.	24. Q-Kt4	B-K2
R-Blch, K-Q3 (if 30Kt-B3, 31.	25. Kt-Q5	Q-Q3
Kt-Q4 wins); 31. $Kt-Q2!$ and wins.	26. RxR	RxR
24 B-Q3	27. Kt-K3	Q-B5
25. RxB QxR	28. QxQ	KtxQ
26. QxR R-B1	29. P-Q5	R-Q1
27. R-K1	30. Kt-K5	BxP
Blohm had overlooked this mate	31. Kt-B6	R-Q3
threat, which wins <u>all</u> the	32. KtxP	PxP
marbles.	33. Kt-QKt5	R-Q1
27 QxQP	34. K-B1	B-B3
28. QxKt Q-B4	35. P-Kt3	P-Kt3
29. Q-Q6ch K-B1	36. P-R4	K-Kt2
30. R-Blch K-Kt2	37. Kt-B7	R-KR1
31. R-B7ch K-R1	38. K-Kt1	Kt-K7ch
32. Q-B6ch K-Kt1	39. K-Kt2	Kt-B6
33. Q-Kt7 Mate	40. R-Q3	P-Q5
	41. Kt-B4	B-Q1
(Notes by Eric Osbun)	42. Kt-Kt5	KtxKt
	43. PxKt	R-R5
Game No. 976Queen's Gambit	44. 3-Q1	B-B2
White Black	45. R-QR1	R-R7ch
W. Addison E. Pruner	46. K-B3	R-R6ch
2-04 2-04	4.7 X=X4.	54.5
· ·		

23.	Q-B2	BxP		8.	B-Q3	Q	Kt-Q2	
24.	QxB	RxB		9.	0-0	K	(t-Bl	
25.	R-B2	Kt-Q6]	10.	QR-K1	K	t-Kt3	
RESIG	NS		1	11.	Kt-K4	В	3-Q2	
(Notes by	C. M. Capp	os)		12.	P-B4!	P	-B4	
` .				13.	P-Q5	Q	-B2	
NINTH DAVI	S RATED TO	JRNAMENT		14.	BxKt	F	'xB	
				15.	P-Q6	В	ВxР	
Game No. 9				16.	KtxPch	K	ζ-Q1	
	hite	Black		17.	BxKt	R	PxB	
<u>s. s</u>	osnick l	R. Murian		18.	Kt-K5!	E	3xKt	
1.	P-KB4	P-Q4		19.	RxB	k	(-B1	
2.	P-K3	P-KKt3	2	20.	KtxB	R	t-Q1	
3.	Kt-KB3	B-Kt2		21.	Q-Kt5	Q	xKt	
4.	B-K2	Kt-KB3	2	22.	RxPch	K	K-Ktl	
5.	P-QKt3	Kt-K5		23.	Q-K5ch	Q	2-Q3	
	P-B3	Kt-QB3		24.	R-Q1!	R	esigns	
	B-Kt2	0-0					_	
8.	P-Q3	Kt-B3			0.54			
9.	•	P-K3						
	P-KR3	Kt-K2		25	I Ma			
	QKt-Q2	Kt-B4				1 ***	1	
12.	•	Kt.xP				23		
13.	-	KtxR			R	······································		
14.		Kt-R4			ann 🖴 aan			
	Kt-Kt5	P-KR3		////// &	925E ************************************		介	
16.		PxKt		立			TT 378	
17.		PxB					₩ <u></u>	
	R-B6!!	P-B4						
19.		P-Q5	Game No	. 9	81 - Fo	our K	nights	
	Kt- K 4	R-K1		Wh	ite		Black	
21.		R-K2	Ε.	Le	itis	S. v	on Oett	ingen
	R-R6!	BxR		1.	P-K4		P-K4	
	Kt-B6ch	K-Kt2		2.	Kt-QB3		Kt-KB3	
	QxB Mate	K KC2		3.	Kt-B3		Kt-B3	
2	, II			4.	B-B4		B-B4	
Game No. 9	80 - Black	mar-Diemer		5.	P-Q3		P-Q3	
	ite	Black		6.	P-KR3		B-K3	
		von Oettinge	en.	7.	B-Kt3		P-QR3	
	P-K4	P-Q4	-11	8.	B-K3		B-QKt5	
	P-Q4	PxP		9.	0-0	(Q-Q2	
	r-Q4 Kt-QB3	Kt-KB3	1	.0.	P-R3		B-R4	
	кс-Qвз Р-В3	PxP	1	1.	BxB		PxB	
	r-b3 KtxP	P-K3	1	2.	P-QKt4		B- K t3	
	KLXP B-KKt5	B-K2			BxB		PxB	
	D-KKC) Q-Q2	P-B3			QKt-R4		Q-QB2	
7.	ų-ųz	r-D3			•			

15. P-B4	0-0	30. Kt-B	RxKt!
16. Kt-B3	KKt-R4	31. PxR	$R \times P$
17. P-B5	$P_{\mathbf{X}}P$	32. KR-B2	Kt-R6ch
18. KtxKtP	Q-B2	33. K-B1	P-KKt4
19.Kt-Kt5	Q-Kt3	34. K-K1	P-Kt5
20. KtxKP	R-B3	35. Q-Kt3	9 Q-B3
21. P-B4	KtxP	36. QR-Q2	2 P-R4
22. KtxKt	PxKt	37. Q-R2	Q-R8ch
23 . Kt-B7	QR-KB1	38. R-Q1	Q-B6ch
24. Kt-Q5	R(3)-B2	39. QR-Q2	Q-B8ch
25. Q-Q2	Kt-Q5	40. R-Q1	Q- K6 ch
26. R-R2	P-B6	41. K-B1	P-R5
27. Q-KB2	Kt-K3	42. R-QKt	2 P-K t6
28. P-Kt3	Kt-Kt4	43. QxKt	P-Kt7ch
29. Q-R2	Q-K3	44. QxPcl	n PxQdch
		45. KxP a	and resigns.

AGENDA OF THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE CHESS FEDERATION

The Annual Meeting of the members of the California State Chess Federation will be held on Saturday evening, May 27, 1967, at the Hacienda Motel in Fresno. When President Isaac Kashdan calls the meeting to order, the following agenda will be in order:

- Minutes of the previous meeting (Spencer Van Gelder, Secretary).
- 2. Treasurer's Report (Dr. Ralph Hultgren).
- 3. Report of the Tournament Committee (President Kashdan is ex-officio chairman of the Gommittee. Gordon S. Barrett is chairman of the southern section and Guthrie McClain is chairman of the northern).
 - 4. New Business.
 - 5. Old Business.
 - 6. Election of Directors. (Each area votes for its director(s).)

The incumbent directors are:

- 1. At Large, Southern California: Irving Rivise.
 2. At Large, Noarthern California: Vacant
 3. Los Angeles: H. D. Rader
 4. Los Angeles: Gordon S. Barrett
 5. San Diego Area: John Alexander
 6. Northern California: Lawrence Zipfel
 7. Redwood Empire Area: Mike Goodall
 8. Central California John Blackstone
 9. Riverside-San Bernardina Area: Charles Walker
- 10. San Francisco Area: Guthrie McClain

TASKS:

No. 257 Anthony Taffs U.S. Problem Bulletin



Mate in 3

No. 258 Ladislav Knotek Svelozor, 1917



Mate in 3

SOLUTIONS:

No. 251 (Tuzar) 1. Qh3 (v

1. Qh3 (waiting). Various strategies, including self-block (1...PxS; 2. Bb3ch, Ke4; 3. Pd3).

No. 252 (Taffs)

1. Pc4 threatening RxRch or Rb5ch.

If 1...PxP e.p.; 2. Sc5.

No. 253 (Pawecki)

1. Qa6. White must choose carefully between Pc3ch and Pc4ch after Black's two choices.

No. 254 (Paros)

1... Bf4; 2. Rc2, Bh2; 3. Sf2. If White could move first, 1. Re4, Bh4; 2. Sf4 would do it. The problem is that after 1... Bh4; 2. Re4 all

of Black's moves stop mate!

No. 255 (Marble)

Only 1. Kf6 is correct. As Holmes realized, after 1. Pe3 Elack plays 1...Pf1 (White S)

and the pawn blocks 2. Se3.

No. 256 (Lasker's Magazine) 1. Pc8 (Black B). Once you get the hang of it, it's easy.