

Richard Shorman**Chess****BOBBY FISCHER'S OPEN LETTER**

Under the title "The World Champion Speaks", international grandmaster **Larry Evans** presented a letter from world champion **Bobby Fischer** to his column in "Chess Life & Review" (Nov. 34, pp. 715-16). Part of Fischer's message concerned the rules dispute he is having with the World Chess Federation (FIDE):

In April 34, p. 271, you state my rules are not fair. What nonsense! As if I had some great advantage because of the nine to nine tie clause. Alex Binder wrote: "In Jan 34, p. 30, a cablegram from Bobby Fischer to FIDE stated: 'Urge adoption of ten wins to decide 1975 match, draws not counting, champion to retain title in nine wins to nine.' This means that the champion needs only nine to win and the challenger must win by at least two. Do you feel this fair and why?" Your answer: "No, it isn't fair. The whole idea of not counting draws is to eliminate a draw match. Historically the first player to win six games was good enough for Lasker, Capablanca, and Alekhine. Why isn't it good enough for Bobby Fischer?"

Okay. Here's my answer to Mr. Binder and then to you, Larry. Mr. Binder should have read more carefully, because he seems under the illusion that if 9 wins to 9, I win the match. But I said 9 wins to 9 **retains** title. That's a big difference. If my match with Spassky would have been 12 to 12 he would have retained title—not won the match (and not even having to win a single game at that, if it so turned out every game was a draw). The money would be split equally and the match declared a draw—but Spassky would have kept the title. Okay? Nothing unfair there! Then Mr. Binder says, "the challenger must win by at least two." Yes. But the champion must **also** win by at least two. When the champion gets 9 points the match isn't automatically over, although at that stage his title is secure. It continues until he wins 10 games unless the challenger wins 9 first to tie him. This is much the same as the first Petrosian-Spassky match when Petrosian got the needed 12 points before 24 games were played: his title was secure but the match continued until he got at least 12½ or Spassky tied him 12 to 12.

Now to your answer: "No, it isn't fair. The whole idea of not counting draws is to eliminate a draw match." Nonsense! The whole idea is to make sure the players draw blood by winning games, and the spectators get their money's worth. And most importantly as an accurate test of who is the world's best player.

Then you say: "Historically the first player to win six games was good enough for Lasker, Capablanca and Alekhine. Why isn't it good enough for Bobby Fischer?"

What was good enough for them is not necessarily always good enough for me and I'm sure if they were alive today the feeling would be mutual. The real question is: which is the best title system?

But if you go back why isn't what was good enough for Steinitz, Tchigorin, **Lasker** (too), Gunsberg, Zukertort, etc., etc., good enough for Larry Evans? Because they all played under the ten win system I proposed (and some matches with the 9-9 tie clause). Incidentally, Larry, the Capa-Alekhine match **did** have a draw clause at 5-5. Yes, Alekhine had to win by 6-4 to take the title just the same as my match proposal. So you don't know what you're talking about altogether on this subject.

The Russians are also making a big to-do about this tie clause even though they are **well aware** from their own books of these facts. Yet they pretend that I'm asking for an **unprecedented** advantage! (See page 18 "Ten Champions of the World," Moscow 1972 in Russian for Capa-Alekhine regulations—fotocopy enclosed.)

In conclusion I would like to answer one last wild rumor that the Russians are busily spreading—namely that in 1971 when FIDE changed the match system to the first player to win six games (no tie clause, effective 1975) that this was **my proposal** and at my behest. This is completely untrue. I also proposed ten wins at that time and as a matter of fact I proposed that the ten win system go into effect for the 1972 title match! I am responsible for what I told Mr. Edmondson (the U.S. representative to FIDE) not for what compromise he and FIDE worked out without my approval or even knowledge. These are the **facts**—if anyone is interested in those.

KARPOV WINS BY A DRAW

Playing his last game with **Viktor Korchnoi** to a draw, 23-year-old Soviet grandmaster **Anatoly Karpov** finished their ten-week battle with a score of 3-2. He is now the official challenger for Fischer's FIDE world chess crown or possibly even the champion, if Fischer refuses to play in April 1975. Had Korchnoi won his final game with Karpov, the challenger for the world championship (and perhaps the championship itself) would have been decided by lot (!).

White: Anatoly Karpov. Black: Viktor Korchnoi. Moscow, 1974; Match Game no. 24. Queen's Gambit Accepted 1 Nf3 d5 2 d4 Nf6 3 c4 dc 4 e3 g6 5 Bc4 Bg7 6 0-0 0-0 7 b3 c6 8 Bb2 Bg4 9 Nbd2 Nbd7 10 h3 Bf5 11 Re1 Nb6 12 Bf1 Ne4 13 Ne4 Be4 14 Nd2 Bf5 15 Rc1 Rc8 16 Qe2 Rc7 17 a4 Bc8 18 Ba3 Be6 19 Qd1 Re8 20 Ne4 f5 21 Nc5 Bf7 22 Bb2 Nd7 23 Nd3 Rc8 24 b4 a5 25 ba Qa5 26 Bc3 Qa7 27 a5 c5 28 Qa4 Nb6 29 Qa1 Nd5 30 Nc5 Nc3 31 Qc3 Drawn.

SAN JOSE TOURNAMENT RESULTS

The Bill Adams West Coast Memorial attracted 91 players to the San Jose Chess Club for a USCF-rated, no-smoking, four-round Swiss system event, Nov. 16-17, directed by **William Bates**. Complete results:

Open-A Division

1st-2nd, Steve Spencer (2192), Berkeley, and Eleuterio Alzasua (2086), San Jose, 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ -1 $\frac{1}{2}$, \$150 each; **1st A**, Frank Flynn (1878), Portola Valley, 3-1, \$125.

B-C DIVISION

1st B, Fernando Almerda (1694), Concord, 4-0, \$120; **2nd B**, Grayson Perkins (1643), Los Gatos, 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ -1 $\frac{1}{2}$, \$70; **1st C**, Mike Huber (1576), San Jose, 3-1, \$110; **2nd-3rd C**, Alexandro Duv-al (1439) and Michael Perry (1430), both San Jose, 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ -1 $\frac{1}{2}$, \$85 each.

D-E & UNRATED DIVISION

1st-6th D-E, Bruce Feerick (1382), Mt. View, J. Griffiths (1399), Abraham Sprinsock (1359), Harry Bender (1324), Frederick Muollo (1227) and Bob Brooks (1177), all San Jose, 3-1, \$27.50 each; **1st-2nd Unrated**, Jaime Mendoza and David Anderson, both San Jose, 4-0, \$55 each.

LERA SAN JOSE CLASS CHAMPIONSHIPS

The LERA San Jose Class Championships will be held at the LERA Auditorium in Sunnyvale, Nov. 29-Dec. 1. **Ted and Ruby Yudacufski** will direct the six-round Swiss. Entry is \$25 for Open, \$20 for A or B, and \$15 for C, D-E or Unrated if mailed by Nov. 26 to P.O. Box 451, Sunnyvale, Calif. 94088; otherwise \$5 more. Round one begins 10 a.m., Friday, Nov. 29.

"PAWN ENDINGS" BOOK REVIEW

by **James Schroeder**

Ken Smith has done it again! This is another great contribution to chess literature and is absolutely essential reading for **every** chess player. The title means King and Pawn endings, of course, and is translated (by Mary Lasher) from the Russian. There are more than 600 diagrams and more than 900 positions discussed. The price per position is less than 1.3 cents. That's a helluva bargain. There is no way you can dispute the value of this work, nor can you refute my contention that you **must** read it. The information in this book is relevant to **all** endings. For example, in order to win most Rook and Pawn endings the stronger side must be able to win after an exchange of Rooks. If you cannot win, then the position is usually a draw. Do you know how to win?

Order "Pawn Endings" by Averbakh and Maizelis (\$11, hardcover, 318 pages) from Chess Digest, P.O. Box 21225, Dallas, Texas 75211. Important: Say Schroeder sends you!